

OXFORD

GREEK TRAGEDY

on the **MOVE**

The Birth of a Panhellenic Art Form
c.500–300 BC



EDMUND STEWART

VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

GREEK TRAGEDY ON THE MOVE

Greek Tragedy on the Move

The Birth of a Panhellenic Art Form
c.500–300 BC

EDMUND STEWART

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Edmund Stewart 2017

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2017

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016957204

ISBN 978-0-19-874726-0

Printed and bound by
CPI Group (UK) Ltd, Croydon, CR0 4YY

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

Acknowledgements

This book began its genesis in the then office of Michael Lurie in the David Hume Tower at the University of Edinburgh. At that time, I was looking for a dissertation topic at the end of my undergraduate degree and I had stumbled on the issue of tragedy and Athenian democratic politics. To Michael are due my first thanks for inspiring me to continue into postgraduate study and eventually to turn my first tentative scribbles into the present monograph. I must also not fail to mention the help and encouragement I received at an early stage, and indeed subsequently, from Douglas Cairns and Bill Allan at Edinburgh and Oxford respectively.

The project was then to continue at the University of Nottingham. I owe a great debt of gratitude to my PhD supervisors Patrick Finglass and Alan Sommerstein. They have tirelessly read and commented on frequent drafts of the thesis, and later the book itself. Together they have taught me a great deal of what I know about the subject. In addition, Judith Mossman has been a constant source of help and encouragement. She and Ian Rutherford, as my PhD examiners, have greatly assisted me in the process of turning the PhD thesis into a book, for which I am very grateful.

Many other people, both teachers and colleagues, have helped me over the years in different ways and without their kind contributions and assistance this work would not have been possible. I wish to thank particularly the readers and editors at Oxford University Press, Judith Affleck, Roger Brock, Eric Csapo, Edward Harris, Malcolm Heath, Stephen Hodgkinson, Jason Koenig, Sian Lewis, Doug Lee, Helen Lovatt, Andrew McGregor, James Morwood, Nicholas Purcell, Richard Rawles, Emma Stafford, and Betine van Zyl Smit.

My final and greatest thanks must go to my family, to whom this work is dedicated, and, in particular, my parents Gordon and Teresa and my wife Louise.

*Οὐδὲν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι πατὴρ καὶ μητὴρ ἄμεινον
ἔπλετο, οἷσ' ὁσίη, Κύρνε, μέμλε δίκη.*

One's parents are the greatest treasure in the world,
Cyrnus, for all who value righteousness.

(Theognis 131–2, trans. West)

*Γυναῖκα ἀνδρείαν τίς εὐρήσει; τιμιωτέρα δέ ἐστιν λίθων πολυτελῶν
ἢ τοιαύτη.*

Who can find a good wife? She is more precious than jewels.

(Proverbs 31:10)

Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	xiii
<i>List of Abbreviations</i>	xv
Introduction	1
The Problem	1
1. Recent Approaches	1
a. Athens and Tragedy	1
b. Tragedy beyond Athens	5
2. New Directions	9
a. Panhellenic Tragedy	9
b. Panhellenic Networks	12
c. Professionalism and Travel	13
3. The Argument	18
1. The Background I: Travelling Heroes and Panhellenic Tragedy	19
Introduction	19
1. The Travelling Hero in Greek Poetry	20
2. Panhellenic Tragedy	22
Conclusion	31
2. The Background II: Wandering Poets, Panhellenic Networks, and Professionalism	33
1. Introduction: Mobility in Archaic and Classical Greece	33
a. The Culture of Travel in Ancient Greece	33
b. Professionalism and Travel	34
2. Networks of Non-Dramatic Poets c.700–300 BC	43
a. Aegean and Asia Minor	45
b. The Greek Mainland	48
c. The Greek West	53
3. Reasons and Motivations for the Travel of Poets	55
a. Exiles and Economic Migrants	56
b. The Pursuit of Fame	57
c. The Pursuit of Wealth	60
Conclusion	63

3. Tragedy in Attica c.500–300 BC	65
Introduction	65
1. The Audience	66
2. Non-Athenian Performers	69
a. Origins	73
b. Impact	82
Conclusion	90
4. Tragedy outside Attica c.500–450 BC	93
Introduction	93
1. Dramatic Performances outside Attica	94
a. The Greek Mainland	94
b. The Greek West	97
2. The Plays	105
a. Aeschylus' <i>Aetnaeae</i>	105
b. Aeschylus' <i>Persians</i> and its Trilogy	109
Conclusion	114
5. Tragedy outside Attica c.450–400 BC	117
Introduction	117
1. Euripides' <i>Archelaus</i> , <i>Temenus</i> , and <i>Temenidae</i>	118
a. The Myth and its Purpose	118
b. Possibilities for Performance	126
2. Euripides' <i>Andromache</i>	139
3. Euripides' <i>Captive Melanippe</i> and <i>Aeolus</i>	144
a. The Myth and the Plays	144
b. Possibilities for Performance	151
Conclusion	158
6. Tragedy outside Attica c.400–300 BC	161
Introduction	161
1. A New Era?	164
a. The Death of Political Tragedy?	164
b. Specialization and Professionalization: The Rise of the Acting Profession?	169
c. Old Tragedy or New Tragedy?	177
d. Conclusion	178
2. The Dissemination of Tragedy in the Fourth Century	179
a. Performance Venues	179
b. Performers	188
Conclusion	193

Contents

xi

Conclusion	195
Appendices	199
Appendix 1: The Settings of Plays of Greek Tragedy and Satyr Play	201
Appendix 2: Non-Citizen Performers in Attica	211
Appendix 3: Phrynichus in Sicily?	223
<i>Bibliography</i>	227
<i>Index</i>	255

List of Tables

1.1. The settings of plays of Greek tragedy	26
2.1. Greek poets c.700–350	43
3.1. Non-citizen performers in Athens by origin	73
3.2. Non-Athenian poets in Athens	83
3.3. Non-citizen performers in Athens by date	86

List of Abbreviations

APF	J.K. Davies, <i>Athenian Propertied Families</i> (Oxford 1971).
ARV ²	J.D. Beazley, <i>Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters</i> , 3 vols. (2nd edn., Oxford 1963).
Billerbeck	M. Billerbeck (ed.), <i>Stephani Byzantii Ethnica</i> , 4 vols. to date (Berlin and New York 2006–).
C–S	E. Csapo and W.J. Slater, <i>The Context of Ancient Drama</i> (Ann Arbor 1995).
de Marco	V. de Marco (ed.), <i>Scholia in Sophoclis Oedipum Coloneum</i> (Rome 1952).
DFA ²	A.W. Pickard-Cambridge, <i>The Dramatic Festivals of Athens</i> (2nd edn., rev. J. Gould and D.M. Lewis; Oxford 1988).
Dilts	M.R. Dilts (ed.), <i>Scholia in Aeschinem</i> (Leipzig 1992).
Dindorf	W. Dindorf (ed.), <i>Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam ex codicibus aucta et emendata</i> , 2 vols. (Oxford 1855).
D–K	H. Diels (ed.), <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> , 3 vols. (6th edn., rev. W. Kranz, Berlin 1951–2).
Drachmann	A.B. Drachmann (ed.), <i>Scholia vetera in Pindari carmina</i> , 3 vols. (Leipzig 1903–27).
Ebert	J. Ebert (ed.), <i>Griechische Epigramme auf Sieger an gymnischen und hippischen Agonen</i> (Berlin 1972).
EGF	M. Davies (ed.), <i>Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta</i> (Göttingen 1988).
EGM	R. L. Fowler, <i>Early Greek Mythography</i> , 2 vols. (Oxford 2000–13).
FD III.2	G. Colin (ed.), <i>Fouilles de Delphes: Tome III, Épigraphie: Fascicule II, Inscriptions du Trésor des Athéniens</i> (Paris 1909–13).
FD III.5	E. Bourguet (ed.), <i>Fouilles de Delphes: Tome III, Épigraphie: Fascicule V, Les Comptes du IV^e Siècle</i> (Paris 1932).
FGE	D.L. Page (ed.), <i>Further Greek Epigrams</i> (Cambridge 1981).
FGrHist	F. Jacoby et al. (eds.), <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> (1923–).
Finglass	M. Davies, and P.J. Finglass (eds.), <i>Stesichorus: The Poems</i> (Cambridge 2014).

- Gow A.S.F. Gow (ed.), *Machon: The Fragments* (Cambridge 1965).
- GP A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip and Some Contemporary Epigrams*, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1968).
- Herington C.J. Herington (ed.), *The Older Scholia on the Prometheus Bound* (*Mnem. Suppl.* 19, Leiden 1972).
- HE A.S.F. Gow and D.L. Page (eds.), *The Greek Anthology. Hellenistic Epigrams*, 2 vols. (Cambridge 1965).
- Holwerda D. Holwerda and W.J.W. Koster (eds.), *Scholia in Aristophanem*, 4 parts (Groningen 1960–).
- IG I³ D.M. Lewis et al. (eds.), *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno Antiores*, 3 vols. (Berlin and New York 1981–98).
- IG II-III² J. Kirchner (ed.), *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis anno posteriores*, 4 vols. (Berlin 1913–40).
- IG V F. Hiller (ed.), *Inscriptiones Laconiae, Messeniae, Arcadiae: Fasciculus Alter, Inscriptiones Arcadiae* (Berlin 1913).
- IG XI/2 P. Hiller (ed.) *Inscriptiones Graecae: Volumen XI, Fasciculi Tertii Tabulae* (Berlin 1927).
- IG XI/4 P. Roussel (ed.), *Inscriptiones Deli: Fasciculus IV* (Berlin 1914).
- IG XII/6 K. Hallof and A. P. Matthaiou (eds.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Insularum Maris Aegaei praeter Delum: Fasciculus VI, Inscriptiones Chii et Sami cum Corassiis Icariaque*, 2 vols. to date (Berlin and New York 2000–).
- IG XII/8 C. Friedrich (ed.), *Inscriptiones Insularum Maris Thracici* (Berlin 1909).
- IG XII/9 E. Ziebarth (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Insularum Maris Aegaei praeter Delum: Fasciculus IX, Inscriptiones Euboeae Insulae* (Berlin 1915).
- IG XII Suppl. F. Hiller (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Insularum Maris Aegaei Praeter Delum: Supplementum* (Berlin 1939).
- IGUR L. Moretti (ed.), *Inscriptiones Graecae Urbis Romae*, 4 vols. (Rome 1968).
- I Iasos W. Blümel (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Iasos*, 2 vols. (Bonn 1985).
- I Magn O. Kern (ed.), *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Maeander* (Berlin 1900).
- IRDF B.W. Millis and S. D. Olson (eds.), *Inscriptional Records for the Dramatic Festivals in Athens: IG II² 2318–2325 and Related Texts* (Leiden and Boston 2012).
- K–A R. Kassel and C.F.L. Austin (eds.), *Poetae Comici Graeci*, 8 vols. to date (Berlin and New York 1983–).

- LCS A.D. Trendall, *The Red Figure Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily*, 2 vols. (Oxford 1967).
- LCS Suppl. II A.D. Trendall, *The Red Figure Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily: Second Supplement*. (BICS Suppl. 31; London 1973).
- LCS Suppl. III A.D. Trendall, *The Red Figure Vases of Lucania, Campania and Sicily. Third Supplement (Consolidated)*. (BICS Suppl. 41; London 1983).
- Leurini A. Leurini (ed.), *Ionis Chii: Testimonia et Fragmenta* (2nd edn., Amsterdam 2000).
- LIMC L. Kahil (ed.), *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae*, 8 vols. (Munich 1981–99).
- Maehler H. Maehler (ed.), *Die Lieder des Bakchylides*, 2 vols. (Leiden 1982).
- Meineke A. Meineke (ed.), *Stephani Byzantii Ethnicorum quae supersunt* (2nd edn., Graz 1958).
- M–L R. Meiggs, and D. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions* (2nd edn., Oxford 1988).
- MOMC³ T.B.L. Webster, and J.R. Green, *Monuments Illustrating Old and Middle Comedy* (BICS Suppl. 39; 3rd edn., London 1978).
- MTS² T.B.L. Webster, *Monuments Illustrating Tragedy and Satyr Play* (BICS Suppl. 20; 2nd edn., London 1967).
- M–W R. Merkelbach, and M.L. West (eds.), *Fragmenta Hesiodae* (Oxford 1967).
- O–B M.J. Osborne, and S.G. Byrne, *The Foreign Residents of Athens* (Leuven 1996).
- O'Connor J.B. O'Connor, *Chapters in the History of Actors and Acting in Ancient Greece* (Chicago 1908).
- OGIS W. Dittenburger (ed.), *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae: Supplementum Sylloges Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1903).
- Pfeiffer R. Pfeiffer (ed.), *Callimachus*, 2 vols. (Oxford 1949–53).
- Powell J. U. Powell (ed.), *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford 1925).
- PMG D.L. Page (ed.), *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford 1962).
- PMGF M. Davies (ed.), *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 1 vol. to date (Oxford 1991–).
- P.Oxy. B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt, et al. (eds.), *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (London 1898–).
- PV² A.D. Trendall, *Phlyax Vases* (BICS Suppl. 19; 2nd edn., London 1967).
- R–O P.J. Rhodes, and R. Osborne, *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC* (Oxford 2003).

- RVAp A.D. Trendall and A. Cambitoglou, *The Red-Figured Vases of Apulia*, 2 vols. (Oxford 1978–82).
- RVAp Supp. II A.D. Trendall, and A. Cambitoglou, *Second Supplement to The Red-Figured Vases of Apulia*, 2 vols. (BICS Suppl. 60, London 1991–2).
- RVP A.D. Trendall, *The Red-Figured Vases of Paestum* (Rome 1987).
- Schorn S. Schorn (ed.), *Satyros aus Kallatis: Sammlung der Fragmente mit Kommentar* (Basel 2004).
- Schwartz E. Schwartz (ed.), *Scholia in Euripidem* (Berlin 1887–91).
- SEG J.J.E. Hondius et al. (eds.), *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, 55 vols. to date (Leiden 1923).
- Suppl. Hell. H. Lloyd-Jones and P.J. Parsons (eds.), *Supplementum Hellenisticum* (Texte und Kommentare 11; Berlin and New York 1983).
- SIG³ W. Dittenberger (ed.), *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 4 vols. (3rd edn., Leipzig 1915–24).
- S–M B. Snell and H. Maehler (eds.), *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, 2 vols. (Leipzig 1987–9).
- Stephanis I.E. Stephanis, *Διονυσιακοὶ Τεχνῖται* (Heracleion 1988).
- Sutton D.F. Sutton, *Dithyrambographi Graeci* (Hildesheim 1989).
- TrGF B. Snell, R. Kannicht, and S. Radt (eds.), *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, 5 vols. (Göttingen 1971–2004).
- Voigt E.-M. Voigt (ed.), *Sappho et Alcaeus: Fragmenta* (Amsterdam 1971).
- Wehrli F. Wehrli (ed.), *Die Schule des Aristoteles*, 12 vols. (Basel and Stuttgart 1944–1959).
- Wendel C. Wendel (ed.), *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera* (Berlin 1958).
- West M.L. West (ed.), *Iambi et elegi graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*, 2 vols. (2nd edn., Oxford 1989–92).

Introduction

THE PROBLEM

What made Greek tragedy Greek? Tragedy had become astonishingly popular across the entire Greek world from at least the start of the Hellenistic period, at the turn of the fourth and third centuries BC. Performances were taking place at an increasing number of international festivals, held in regions as disparate as Sicily and Asia Minor, the Libyan deserts, and the Black Sea coast.¹ Yet most of the early dramatic performances that are known to us took place in one city, Athens, and all the poets whose plays survive intact were Athenian and active in the fifth century. How and why, then, was tragedy disseminated among the cities of the Greek world? What was the process by which tragedy came to be canonized as part of the common Greek literary heritage? This book aims to provide answers to both of these questions: to chart and explain the evolution of a distinctively Greek or ‘Panhellenic’ genre over the previous two centuries, throughout the archaic and classical periods (c.500–300 BC).

1. RECENT APPROACHES

a. Athens and Tragedy

Perhaps no other part of the cultural legacy of the Greeks—not even sculpture, philosophy, rhetoric, or history—has been so closely associated with one place, Athens, and one time, the fifth century, as has

¹ See Parker (2004) for an expansion of festivals from the third century.

tragedy. H.D.F. Kitto, though writing over seventy years ago, provides perhaps the best and boldest statement of the ‘Athenocentric’ view:

Greek drama is peculiarly the creation and glory of Athens. Athens and the Theatre of Dionysus are, in a very real sense, its Unity of Place. Not only were the plays performed in this theatre, not only was nearly every dramatic poet of eminence an Athenian, not only does the art as a whole bear indelibly the mark of Athenian intelligence and plastic imagination; beyond all this Greek drama is in a special degree the work of the Athenian people. All Attic drama, tragic and comic, was composed for one of the Festivals of Dionysus; this fact is capital.²

While many scholars today would probably not accept such a statement without qualifications, Kitto nonetheless articulates some of the basic premises from which, until comparatively recently, much of the literary criticism of tragedy has begun. These are, firstly, that Athenians were the primary audience and Athens the primary location of performance and, secondly, that tragedy was a ‘peculiarly’ Athenian cultural form.

Neither of these assumptions excludes the possibility that other Greeks may have watched or even composed some of the plays performed in antiquity. Kitto only notes that ‘nearly’ all tragedians of eminence were Athenian. Yet, while allowing for exceptions, Kitto stresses the primacy of Athens and, more than that, the notion of tragedy as a distinctively Athenian art-form: a view that has long gone unchallenged. Indeed, it has become possible to refer to ‘Attic’ or ‘Athenian’ rather than ‘Greek’ tragedy.³ As Edith Hall has argued:

While other ancient cities and eras had other genres—epic, lyric, biography, fiction—it was in the theatre that the classical Athenian encountered many of the roles through which they imagined themselves.⁴

² Kitto (2011) 336.

³ Hall (1997) 94: “Classical Greek Tragedy” is now more usually and more accurately called “fifth century Athenian tragedy”; cf. the judgement of Csapo (2014) 3 that ‘by the late 1980s ancient drama was no longer “Greek” but securely “Athenian”’. ‘Attic tragedy’: e.g. Podlecki (1986); Griffin (1998); Seaford (2000); Burian (2011); ‘Athenian tragedy’: Carter in Griffith and Carter (2011) 11: ‘whether or not it was an Athenian invention...[tragedy] became a distinctively Athenian cultural product’; Taplin (2012); ‘Attic or Athenian drama’: Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.); Rosenbloom (2011) and (2012); on classical tragedy as ‘a typically Athenian form of entertainment’: Kotlińska-Toma (2015) 1.

⁴ Hall (2006) 8.

Non-Athenians might certainly view tragedy as audience members, even participate as performers, but were only included as outsiders in a specifically Athenian occasion. Or, as Alan Sommerstein has put it, ‘to understand fifth century Athenian plays we need to understand the fifth century Athenian theatre audience—and no other.’⁵

An emphasis on Athens as a performance context is, admittedly, far from surprising. Though tragedy was not certainly an invention of the Athenians, the Athenian Dionysia represents the earliest securely attested festival to include dramatic performances (involving at least one actor in addition to a chorus). Most, though (as Kitto noted) not all, dramatists were Athenian; many, though again not all, tragedies in the classical period received their first performance in Athens. But, more than this, scholars have seen tragedy as inextricably linked to the social and political context of fifth-century Athens. Particularly influential was the work of Vernant and Vidal-Naquet, who argued that tragedy flourished in a single place and time—fifth-century Athens—because of a very specific set of historical circumstances (*‘le moment historique de la tragédie en Grèce’*).⁶ This was principally the gradual development of Athenian democracy, which caused the clash between earlier mythical traditions and new political and religious ideas from which tragedy is understood to have developed.⁷

Others, such as Meier and Goldhill, have claimed that the dramatic festivals played a political and social function within the fifth century democracy.⁸ These scholars have suggested that tragedy fulfilled this

⁵ Sommerstein (1998) 64 = (2010a) 119. Cf. Taplin (2012) 227: ‘it seems fair to say... that “Tragedy Outside Athens” remained tragedy that was descended from or had been disseminated from the Athenian core.’

⁶ Vernant (1972a).

⁷ Vernant (1972b). Cf. Schwartz (1986) 185: ‘Tragedy did not flourish until the fifth century and it did not survive the fifth century. It was born with the political culture of the age of Pericles, it both reflected and constituted that culture, and it matured, grew old and died with that culture.’

⁸ Goldhill (2000) 38 argues for the ‘signs and symptoms of democracy in action’ in the organization of the festival. Cf. Wilson (2010) 20, ‘the theatrical festivals of Athens were entirely built around the units of Athenian democratic society’. Meier (1993) 58 states that, ‘after [the] prelude [of the opening events of the Dionysia festival] it is hard to see how politics can have simply disappeared from the stage.’ This claim somewhat begs the question. *Contra* Rhodes (2003), who argues that many of the events and rituals of the festival were typical of the Greek *polis* in general and can be found even in cities that operated under other forms of constitution; cf. Carter (2004), who questions whether the rituals mentioned by Goldhill were democratic or even took place in the fifth century.

function in questioning and encouraging debate on the very civic values underlying the 'pre-play' ceremonies of the Dionysia.⁹ Allan and Kelly have recently made a similar argument, though in this case they suggest that the function of tragedy's 'inherent polyphony' (the result of a lack of a single authorial voice) was to encourage the audience to 'appreciate the benefits' of their society.¹⁰ They concur, however, that 'it matters tremendously that tragedy developed and reached its apogee in Athens, for the management of such a competition between voices helped to develop a uniquely Athenian social and political system, which, for all its similarities with other such systems across the Greek world, remained proudly and self-consciously Athenian.'¹¹ Similarly, Peter Wilson has gone so far as to describe drama as the 'glue of democracy': the term used by the orator Demades in the fourth century to describe the state subsidy of theatre tickets.¹² Tragedy has thus become part of, and arguably inseparable from, the Athenian political legacy.

Some have therefore concluded that the effect of the original fifth-century performances in Athens—the only venue where the pure notions of democracy and the delicate social functions of tragedy can really be seen in action—could not have been replicated easily elsewhere. Another audience, in another context, might enjoy a reperformance for its spectacle and pathos, but it would not understand tragedy in the same way.¹³ As Wilson argues:

The transplantation of tragedy outside this festival structure generated a very different phenomenon. In cities where tragedy took place without these embedded structures—which is to say, *everywhere* other than

⁹ See Goldhill (1987) 68 = (1990) 113–14 on the 'civic discourse' between the 'dominant ideology of the city' and tragedy; cf. Vernant and Vidal Naquet (1972) 24–6; Meier (1993) 47–8; and Burian (2011) esp. 97–9.

¹⁰ Allan and Kelly (2013) 77–8.

¹¹ Allan and Kelly (2013) 78.

¹² Wilson (2011) 42–3; *κόλλαν ὀνομάζων τὰ θεωρικά τῆς δημοκρατίας*, Plut. *Plat. Quaest.* 1011b.

¹³ e.g. Croally (1994) 1–2: 'Unlike any literary event we know in the modern western world, the tragedies were performed on an occasion of great political importance... The invention of tragedy... is dependent itself on the invention of politics... it was not merely an art form.' Wilson (2000) 137, also refers to a modern '(perhaps typically bourgeois) opposition between "art" and "politics" [that] is radically inapplicable' to the ancient theatre. Sourvinou-Inwood (2003) 4–24 argues for the need to reconstruct the 'perceptual filters' of the original audience. Cf. Walcot (1976) 1–6; Osborne (1994) 57–8 = (2010) 36; Goldhill (1997) 54.

classical Athens—it is very hard to say whether its reception was in any way akin to the Athenian experience.¹⁴

Even the authority of Aristotle, perhaps the most influential critic of tragedy to come from outside Attica, has been called into question. Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, for example, has described his views as those of ‘a rationalising thinker, who was not even a participant in the culture, since he did not live in the fifth century and he was not Athenian’.¹⁵

b. Tragedy beyond Athens

Although highly influential, the ‘Athenocentric’ interpretation of tragedy has not gone unchallenged. In the view of some scholars, more emphasis has been placed on tragedy’s democratic political function than is warranted by the available evidence.¹⁶ On the other hand, it is indisputable that tragedy remained popular after the fifth century and beyond the borders of Attica. Although the presence of foreigners at the Dionysia has never been questioned, a recent study of the audience of tragedy by Roselli is notable for its focus on non-citizens.¹⁷ How, we may ask, did their attendance affect the performance context of tragedy? Carter has argued that the Dionysia had a political function, yet one concerned primarily with the presentation of the Athenian city and empire to foreign visitors.¹⁸ Far from being

¹⁴ Wilson (2011) 27.

¹⁵ Sourvinou-Inwood (2003) 2; cf. E. Hall (1996b) who questions why Aristotle makes no mention of the democratic *polis* in his discussion of tragedy. On Aristotle’s status as a metic see Whitehead (1975).

¹⁶ Griffin (1998) 54–61, (1999 b) 90–1; Heath (1987) 5–36, (2006) 263; Taplin (1978) 169–71. The notion of a universal aesthetic function is more in line with ancient literary criticism (e.g. Gorgias B 11, 8–10 D–K; Pl. *Resp.* 605c10–d5; Arist. *Poet.* 1449b24–31), which barely touches on politics. The absence of any mention of the *polis* in Aristotle’s *Poetics* is a constant source of discomfort for ‘Athenocentrists’: see e.g. E. Hall (1996b); Griffith and Carter (2011) 5–6. Goldhill (2000) 36–7; Seaford (2000) 32–3 and Rosenbloom (2012) argue that pleasurable emotions can be political and evocative of the democratic state.

¹⁷ On the presence of foreigners see e.g. Ar. *Ach.* 501–8; Pl. *Symp.* 175e; Aeschin. 3.33–4; Dem. 18.28, 21.74; Isoc. 8.82; Ael. *V.H.* 2.13. See Roselli (2011) 118–25; and my discussion Chapter 3.1.

¹⁸ Carter (2004) 10–13; (2007) 6–8; 42–3. Cf. Zacharia (2003) 73–4: ‘the context [of tragedy] is more imperial than domestic’; Rosenbloom (2011) 357 and 364–5: tragedy presents to its audience a ‘democratically inflected Panhellenism’, which serves as ‘a function of Athenian imperialism’.

an art form intended solely for consumption by the Athenian *dēmos*, tragedy was a genre that had ‘the potential to carry across political boundaries’.¹⁹

Other scholars have been equally willing to look again at the evidence for performance outside Athens. Taplin, among others, has demonstrated the extent to which Greeks in Sicily and Italy were exposed to tragedy by the fourth century.²⁰ He has argued, in particular, that the images on many vases made in the Greek West from the end of the fifth century were inspired in part by the works of Athenian dramatists. This has caused some to wonder how intrinsically Athenian tragedy was to begin with, if it was able to function outside Athens from as early as the fifth century.²¹ Similarly, the growth in reception studies has relatedly encouraged students of classical drama to consider other performance contexts besides that of the first production.²² As Ruth Scodel has suggested, ‘tragedy must have had an audience that the poets could imagine as extended in time and probably also in space.’²³ After a period of some neglect, fourth-century and Hellenistic drama is now a growing area of study.²⁴ We are coming to terms with the fact that tragedy did not die at the end of the fifth century, or even at the end of the classical period, but instead enjoyed a long and complex afterlife that continues to this day.²⁵

Recent research has thus made significant progress, in bringing to our attention a previously neglected element of tragedy’s performance context. However, a number of questions remain. What role did non-Athenians play in this process of dissemination? A common response is that drama was an Athenian ‘export’ that ‘spread’ beyond Attica over time.²⁶ A locally manufactured product was thus shipped abroad.

¹⁹ Carter (2011b) 63 and 64.

²⁰ Taplin (1993), (1997), (1999), (2007), and (2012); cf. Csapo (1986), (2010a) 38–76; Green (1994) 49–88; Allan (2001); Revermann (2005); Taplin and Wyles (2010); Vahtikari (2014).

²¹ As Csapo (2014) 3 has noted, ‘the paradigm [of Athenian political theatre] was saved only at the cost of denying and repressing increasing evidence for the export or reperformance of drama even in the fifth century.’

²² e.g. E. Hall et al. (2000); Macintosh et al. (2005); Gildenhard and Revermann (2010); Bakogianni (2011).

²³ Scodel (2001) 217.

²⁴ See esp. Csapo et al. (2014) and Kotlińska-Toma (2015).

²⁵ On the supposed ‘death’ of theatre, see Easterling (1993) and Le Guen (1995).

²⁶ Spread: Taplin (1999). Export: Dearden (1999); Hanink (2011) 322; Carter (2011b) 46: ‘tragedy was one of Athens’ most significant cultural exports’.

According to this view, the new consumers played a largely passive role, at least at first. Their growing appreciation of the genre may have encouraged increased exports, but their contribution to the development of the genre was minimal. As Sommerstein has argued, the audiences of tragedy outside Athens were ‘derivative from and in a sense parasitic on the original Athenian audience’.²⁷

This approach has the advantage of conveniently reconciling both tragedy’s supposedly Athenian character and the evidence for performance outside Attica. A compromise of this sort is suggested by Mark Griffith, who affirms that ‘fifth century tragedy was BOTH [his emphasis] (a) a specifically Attic art form, designed for a very Athenocentric performance context AND (b) a conspicuously (and increasingly) Panhellenic phenomenon’.²⁸ The description of tragedy as an ‘increasingly’ Panhellenic phenomenon may be taken to imply that there may have been an earlier period when tragedy was less Greek and more Athenian. Taplin summarizes this middle position: ‘from 450 to 350 tragedy went, piecemeal, from being primarily and predominantly Athenian to being shared... throughout the whole Greek world.’²⁹ This sharing of tragedy is thus believed to coincide with a period of change, if no longer of decline, in theatre from the end of the fifth century.³⁰ In particular, the avoidance of political themes is thought to have made tragedy more accessible to non-Athenians.³¹

There are, however, a number of reasons why such a model cannot be entirely satisfactory. First, it does not seek to explain performances of tragedy outside Athens before around 450, except as, again, exceptions that prove the rule. A concentration on the late fifth century excludes, most prominently, the career of Aeschylus and his travels in Sicily, as well as the activities of his non-Athenian rival Pratinas of Phlius, and the work of one of Aeschylus’ own actors, Mynniscus of Chalcis. Second, given the fragmentary state of our evidence it is far

²⁷ Sommerstein (1998) 64 = (2010a) 119. ²⁸ Griffith and Carter (2011) 3.

²⁹ Taplin (2007) 7; cf. Griffith (2007) 24; Visvardi (2011) 274–7; Taplin (2012) 226.

³⁰ E. Hall (2007b) 269: tragedy in around 380 was ‘qualitatively different’ from what it had been in 430; Kuch (1993) 547: ‘in the fourth century a fundamental functional change occurred in the tragic genre’.

³¹ Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 110: ‘the broadening outlook of tragedy at the end of the fifth century, [foreshadows] the transition from the “theatre of the city-state” to a theatre that is more Panhellenic in orientation.’; cf. E. Hall (2007b) 278: ‘during the process by which tragedy metastasised over the entire Greek-speaking world, it became inappropriate for its content to be so explicitly designed to glorify Athens.’

from clear that the works of fourth-century tragedians were markedly different from those of their predecessors.³² The popularity of fifth-century tragedies (and their regular reperformance from 386/5) would seem to suggest otherwise.³³ Finally, those who would treat drama as an export potentially underestimate the impact of non-Athenian dramatic schools and non-Athenian tragedians, some of whom (such as the Sicilian comic poets) preceded or were contemporaneous with their earliest Athenian counterparts.

Important new research is starting to shed light on this final problem of non-Athenian drama. Two regions have been the subject of particular attention: the Greek West and Macedonia. For the former, Boshier sets out the aims of a recent edited volume:

[These are] to take up the problem of defining what south Italian and Sicilian theatre might be, and point to characteristics of a tradition that is particularly Western Greek. . . . Our aim is not to chart the dissemination of Athenian theatre, but to examine the complicated and various traditions that grew up in the west, of which Athenian theatre was an important but still only a component part.³⁴

Boshier is keen to stress that Western dramatists were in no way dependent on Athenian models but may just as easily have influenced their Athenian counterparts.³⁵ For Macedonia, Moloney has similarly emphasized the importance of Macedonian dramatic festivals from the late fifth century, arguing that the Macedonian elite both 'appropriated' Athenian drama and adapted it to suit their purposes.³⁶ Once again the question raised is how a separate, if interconnected, context for the performance of tragedy developed. 'Even if theatre went on to develop into one of "the defining indicators of Greekness",' concludes

³² See Le Guen (1995), (2014) 272–3 and Csapo (2014) 3–5, who question the claim of a decline in political content in the fourth-century and Hellenistic theatre.

³³ See Wilson (1996) 315–16, who notes that the majority of plays quoted by fourth-century orators are from the fifth century.

³⁴ Boshier (2012b) 1.

³⁵ Boshier (2012b) 7: 'All the papers in this volume take up this problem of defining what south Italian and Sicilian theatre might be, and point to characteristics of a tradition that is particularly Western Greek. . . . The chapters examine the complex strands of influence that run, not just from Athens to the West, but from the West to Athens as well.' A similar line of inquiry was previously taken by Dearden (1990), who questioned whether drama produced in fourth century Sicily was 'Athenian or Sicilian'.

³⁶ Moloney (2014) 233, 245–8; cf. Hanink (2010a) on the Macedonian appropriation of the Athenian tragedian Euripides.

Moloney, ‘that general process is not the key background against which to consider the Macedonian engagement with the medium.’³⁷

We are thus beginning to uncover Sicilian and Macedonian drama—but what of *Greek* tragedy? We may be tempted to posit a gradual fusion of Athenian and other local variants of drama, from which emerged a common Greek theatre. But how was this mixing of traditions effected? A common explanation, and one favoured by Taplin, is that Athenian tragedy was disseminated in the Greek West by professional travelling actors, who first appeared in the late fifth century.³⁸ But why were these actors travelling in the first place? And, once again, we should not forget the poets. Why should Aeschylus and Euripides have wished at times to exchange the ease and convenience of the Athenian Dionysia for the dangers and discomfort of travel to the very extremities of the Greek world, in a period before the acting profession is believed to have reached its final form? That the poets did play some role is shown not only by their travels, but also by the texts of tragedy, which contain frequent allusions to regions other than Attica.³⁹ The subject matter of certain plays may have been designed to appeal directly to local audiences: the *Arche-laos* of Euripides, for example, concerned the founding of the kingdom of Macedonia. But how are we to explain the popularity of the overall genre throughout the Greek world? What follows is a proposed solution to two major problems: why did poets and actors seek the attention of a Panhellenic audience and why were they successful?

2. NEW DIRECTIONS

a. Panhellenic Tragedy

I wish to suggest that tragedy did not become Greek, or ‘Panhellenic’, but was so from its very beginning. The fifth and fourth centuries are

³⁷ Moloney (2014) 248, quoting Goldhill (1999) 23 (who is referring to a supposed internationalization of drama after the reign of Alexander the Great).

³⁸ Taplin (2012) 236–47, cf. Dearden (1999) 225; on actors and the acting profession see Easterling and Hall (2002) and Csapo (2010a).

³⁹ Easterling (1994) has argued that the settings or *encomia* of foreign cities, termed ‘localizations’ by Taplin (1999) 43–8, are designed to appeal to future audiences in the locations mentioned.

often, rightly, seen as a period of innovation, development, and change, yet this remains a constant: that tragedy as a genre was always the product of a common Greek culture and one aimed at a Panhellenic audience.

Panhellenism refers to both the inter-city and the inter-regional bonds connecting Greeks from different independent city-states (πόλεις). These cities were fiercely independent and often in open war against each other; yet they shared, among other things, a common language and a common kinship based on mythical genealogies. A shared Hellenic identity is likely to have existed from an early period, though there is some debate as to its form or extent before the Persian wars.⁴⁰ Although the actual term 'Panhellenism' is a modern one, references to οἱ Πανέλληνες ('all the Greeks' or, less literally, Greeks from a multitude of different cities and regions) appear from at least the seventh century in the *Iliad* and the works of Hesiod and Archilochus.⁴¹ The story of the capture of Troy, to take but one example, is one of a united effort by a coalition of heroes drawn from a bewildering variety of locations: from the Ionian Islands, to mainland Greece, and the Aegean.

The poems that documented these exploits, most particularly the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, had become widely known to the Greeks by at least the sixth century.⁴² A central element of Panhellenic culture was poetry, which provided mythological catalogues of heroic ancestors and explained who the Greeks, and their gods, were and where they had come from. The importance of Panhellenism for epic and lyric song has been stressed by Nagy. In his view, not only is it the case that 'no single *polis* has an unequivocal claim on Homer', but in addition 'the *polis* can best promote its prestige by promoting its own traditions in poetry and song on a Panhellenic scale'.⁴³ The content of

⁴⁰ Panhellenism and the Persian Wars: for recent discussion and bibliography see J.M. Hall (2002) 205–20; Mitchell (2007) xix–xxii, 10–19; Vlassopoulos (2013) 8–11.

⁴¹ *Il.* 2.530; Hes. *Op.* 528; [Hes.] fr. 130 M–W; Archil. fr. 102 West; cf. J.M. Hall (2002) 5–8 and Mitchell (2007) xv–xix for an overview; possibly the earliest uses of the English term Panhellenism is by Grote (1851–6), see esp. IV 68–74.

⁴² On early performances of 'Homeric' poems see Hdt. 5.67; [Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228b; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 18.1. On the vase evidence for the reception of stories of the Trojan cycle, see Lowenstam (1997); Snodgrass (1998); Small (2003) 8–36.

⁴³ Nagy (1990) 67, 78–9; cf. Vlassopoulos (2013) 37–8: 'Greek literature was Panhellenic from its earliest attestations... From the very beginning, composing and consuming Greek literature meant participation in a world much bigger than the *polis*'s own community.'

poetry, and its regular performance in different locations by professional rhapsodes, prevented the Homeric poems from being ‘reduced to single speech-events in one time and one place.’⁴⁴

By contrast, it is rarely acknowledged that tragedy was, in origin, a Panhellenic genre. One exception is the work of C.J. Herington, who argued that drama developed not out of Athenian civic ritual or politics but out of earlier poetic genres. Tragedy, along with epic, lyric, rhapsody, and citharody, thus formed what he termed an overall ‘song culture’, created and sustained by a network of city-festivals, including those at Athens.⁴⁵

The institution of the tragic contests at the Athenian Great Dionysia is ... very far from being the radical innovation that it is often represented to be. Rather it marks an end, for it is the last important member of a long series of archaic *agones mousikoi* stretching back at least into the eighth century BC.⁴⁶

If so, the origins and influences that informed tragedy were not exclusively or even primarily Athenian.

This does not mean that tragedy, or individual tragedies, were always known to all Greeks. Every play must have a first performance for a select original audience, which forms an inevitable starting point from which the work is transmitted to other audiences in the form of oral and written reviews, published texts and reperformances. What is argued here is rather that tragedy as a genre was always orientated towards a wider Panhellenic audience, even if a single tragedy’s original audience was of a narrower composition (and even if some works remained obscure and never received a second performance). In focusing on the Panhellenic aspects of tragedy, we need not disregard the individual *polis*, or underestimate the fundamental importance of Athens to the development of tragedy. Quite the contrary: Panhellenic elements draw links *between* cities and allow Greeks to view their identity, either at different times or simultaneously, as citizens of particular cities (πόλεις), members of ethnic tribes (γένη, ἔθνη), and representatives of the wider Greek nation.

⁴⁴ Nagy (2003) 41.

⁴⁵ Herington (1985) 3, 125–6.

⁴⁶ Herington (1985) 9.

b. Panhellenic Networks

If tragedy can be termed Panhellenic in form and origin, our next task is to determine how the genre became Panhellenic in actuality: that is how tragedy moved between Greek communities.

We need not attribute to the Greeks the spirit of ecumenical co-operation and cultural exchange that is meant to characterize modern transnational organizations, such as the European Union. Ironically it is competition, often bitter and sometimes bloody, that appears to have done much to encourage the diffusion of literature and ideas among the Greeks (including tragedy). Modern scholarship has shown how disparate autonomous communities can interact with one another in the absence of a single political centre: a process Renfrew and Cherry termed ‘peer-polity interaction’.⁴⁷ A competitive spirit encourages the individual city to demonstrate its cultural achievements to its neighbours, firstly, by displaying the town to visitors and, secondly, by encouraging its own citizens to enter, and be conspicuous in, international contests. Thus, as Snodgrass and others have noted, Panhellenic cult centres, such as Delphi, developed as important venues for competitive interaction in athletics, music, poetry, and, with the erection of monuments and treasuries, art and architecture.⁴⁸ The notion of culture being transferred directly from a core (such as Athens) outwards towards a periphery is largely inapplicable to the Greek experience.⁴⁹ Instead, the recent development of network theory has encouraged scholars to stress the importance, in the absence of one dominant centre, of a complex web of connections (or networks) running between these cities.⁵⁰ Frequent travel served to sustain and further multiply these networks. As is emphasized by much recent scholarship, the Greeks were a nation of wanderers, in spite of the not inconsiderable dangers and discomfort they could expect to encounter on the way.⁵¹

⁴⁷ Renfrew (1986).

⁴⁸ Snodgrass (1986) 53–4; Scott (2010) 16–17, 256–71.

⁴⁹ On the dissemination of tragedy as a linear development, see the recent summation by Vahtikari (2014) 207: ‘It seems that dramatic performances spread first to the demes of Attica (excluding Aeschylus’ visit to Sicily) and then to Magna Graecia and to Macedonia.’ For the notion of a ‘core’ see Taplin (2012) 227: ‘It seems fair to say that “tragedy outside Athens” remained tragedy that was descended from or had been disseminated from the Athenian core.’

⁵⁰ Horden and Purcell (2000) 342–400; Malkin et al. (2009); Malkin (2011) 3–20; Vlassopoulos (2013) 12–15; Taylor and Vlassopoulos (2015).

⁵¹ See the Introduction to Chapter 2.

In Chapters 2 and 3, we will see that Athens constituted just such a centre within a Panhellenic network and, as such, attracted both non-Athenian audience members and performers.

Poets were a group for which travel was not merely an occasional diversion or necessity, but a way of life central to their work and identity as poets. This tendency of poets to travel has not gone unnoticed. Guarducci, in her 1929 study on Hellenistic epigraphy, identified a group of wandering lyric and epic performers, known only from honorific inscriptions issued by the cities they visited. Further research on the guilds of artists of Dionysus has revealed an intensely international and mobile profession by the third century, while a recent volume on wandering poets, edited by Hunter and Rutherford, attests to continued interest in this aspect of a poet's work.⁵² Yet, despite this, it is rarely acknowledged that the fifth- or fourth-century tragic poet was operating in a similar manner and, where scholars have considered earlier periods, Athens and 'Athenian' tragedy tend to be treated as an exception.⁵³ As Hunter and Rutherford note, 'the song-culture of Athens might seem to have been relatively autochthonous and to have remained generally independent of the mobility of the rest of the Greek world'.⁵⁴ It is argued here that the travels of tragic poets need to be seen in the light of a general culture of wandering and that this long-standing tendency played a major part in the dissemination of tragedy.

c. Professionalism and Travel

Yet, if this is correct, one final question remains: why did poets travel? The answer, I suggest, is that early poets constituted a profession

⁵² See Hunter and Rutherford (2009a). See also Aneziri (2009) on the wanderings of the Hellenistic artists of Dionysus and Cameron (1965) on wandering poets in Egypt in late antiquity. Montiglio (2000) and (2005) 91–116 addresses the question of the peripatetic sage as part of a general discussion on wandering in antiquity.

⁵³ Cf. Guarducci (1929) 630: 'Il costume di portare in giro le proprie abilità intellettuali, iniziatosi fin dai primi tempi del movimento sophistico, assunse nell'età ellenistica proporzioni grandiose'. Important exceptions are (on lyric poetry) Bowie (2007), (2009), and (on lyric and tragedy) Bremer (1991). Hanink (2010a) 58–63 also acknowledges the existence of 'ancient constructions of the "wandering poet"' in the biographies of the tragedians.

⁵⁴ Hunter and Rutherford (2009b) 13.

motivated, like Guarducci's later 'poeti vaganti', by the twin aims of achieving fame and material rewards.⁵⁵

It may be useful to outline here what is meant by professionalism. For both sociologists and modern professionals themselves the word has a complex meaning and indeed it has proved nearly impossible to develop an all-encompassing definition. Part of the difficulty is that society tends to grant professionals enhanced status and privileges.⁵⁶ Individual professions are therefore continually under pressure to justify and assert these privileges in competition with other groups of skilled practitioners. This in turn can lead to widely differing and often deliberately exclusive definitions.⁵⁷ Nevertheless, some common features are generally agreed.⁵⁸ Regular practice in a paid occupation is necessary to separate the professional from the amateur, while specialist knowledge and training excludes the unskilled or semi-skilled labourer. Professions may (though not always) develop organizations to better promote the interests of the group, enhance its shared identity, maintain standards, and restrict membership of the group to those of proven ability. Finally, professionals earn money from their skills; yet they differentiate themselves from those involved in commerce or trade by arguing that profit is not their principal aim. Unlike the retailer or financier, the professional is motivated (or so it is claimed) by his vocation to serve and thereby benefit society through the practice of his art. It should also be stressed that a willingness to be rewarded need not imply that a professional is from a low social background or exclude the possibility of alternative sources of income. As Solon wisely noted, there is no set end to wealth, since with increased prosperity the desire for riches will commonly replace the need for sustenance.⁵⁹

⁵⁵ Guarducci (1929) 629: 'per amore di gloria e spesso anche di lucro'; on the link between professionalism and travel, compare the comment of Chaniotis (1990) 95: 'Ein einigermaßen zuverlässiges Kriterium für die berufliche Beschäftigung mit der Kunst ist auch die intensive Reisetätigkeit von Künstlern'. On evidence for the payment of wandering poets in the Hellenistic period see Schachter and Slater (2007); on earlier literary patronage see Bremer (1991) 44–57.

⁵⁶ See e.g. Larson (2013) x–xi. For the awareness of such privileges in the modern medical profession, for example, see Cruess et al. (2004) 75.

⁵⁷ Cf. Cogan (1955) 105: 'so many advantages have accrued to profession, so many claims to it are made by so many people, that the cutting edge of a definition—be it ever so blunt—is almost sure to draw cries of protest from many aspirants to the title.'

⁵⁸ See Cogan (1953); Moore (1970) 3–20; Cruess et al. (2004); Stern and Arnold (2005).

⁵⁹ *πλούτου δ' οὐδὲν ἔρμα πεφασμένον ἀνδράσι κεῖται*, fr. 13.71 West. On professionalism among poets in archaic Greece see Stewart (2016b).

The ancient term that comes closest to our word ‘professional’ is *τεχνίτης*: one who practises a specialist skill (*τέχνη*). A skill may be here defined as a practical branch of expertise, which can be taught—and indeed requires training and regular practice to attain a degree of competence—and which demonstrably benefits the broader community.⁶⁰ An alternative term for the skilled professional, *δημιουργός* (meaning literally ‘public benefactor’), highlights the importance of this final element: the service provided by such specialists.⁶¹ There was no absolute agreement in antiquity as to which fields of endeavour might constitute a skill and it fell to individual practitioners to demonstrate continually the benefits of each branch of knowledge. The Hippocratic treatise *On the Art*, for example, provides a spirited defence of medicine’s status as *technē* against those who, in an attempt to demonstrate their own learning, are accustomed to denigrate the skills of others.⁶²

Despite this uncertainty, however, ancient authors indicate that skilled professionals formed a separate, if ill-defined, category within the city. Lists of different parallel occupations and skills are common in both the archaic and classical periods, among which, as we shall see, that of the poet features prominently.⁶³ Plato (*Resp.* 369b5–370a4), in envisioning the development of the ideal *polis*, argues that the city needs a minimum of five specialists: a farmer, house-builder, weaver, cobbler, and doctor to provide the basic needs of food, shelter, clothing, and health. Specialization was in fact

⁶⁰ See Roochnik (1996) 17–33.

⁶¹ For the meaning and etymology of the term, see Murakawa (1957) and Jeffery (1973–4).

⁶² εἰσὶ τινες οἱ τέχνην πεποιήνται τὸ τὰς τέχνας αἰσχροπεῖν, ὥς μὲν οἶονται οἱ τοῦτο διαπρησόμενοι, οὐχ ὁ ἐγὼ λέγω, ἀλλ’ ἱστορίας οἰκείης ἐπίδειξιν ποιούμενοι, 1.1–3.

⁶³ Hes. *Op.* 25–6 (potter, carpenter, poet, beggar); Solon fr. 13.43–62 (fisherman, ploughman, craftsman, poet, prophet, doctor); [Aesch.] *PV* 441–506 (skills of house-building, astronomy, mathematics, writing, husbandry, sailing, medicine, prophecy and metallurgy); Soph. *Ant.* 334–64 (skills of seafaring, ploughing, hunting and fishing, husbandry, communal living and house-building, medicine); Ar. *Nub.* 331–4 (sophists, prophets (Θουριομάντις), doctors (ἰατροτέχνες), dithyrambic poets (κυκλίων τε χορῶν ἁσματοκάμπτας), and idlers (ἀργούς)). Ar. *Av.* 905–1057 (poet, oracle-monger, astronomer/surveyor, law-salesmen); Pl. *Ap.* 20c–22d (politicians, poets, craftsmen); Pl. *Phaedr.* 248d1–e2 (philosopher; king; politician/financier; gymnast/doctor (φιλοπόνου γυμναστικοῦ ἢ περὶ σώματος ἱασίν τινος ἔσομένου); prophet; poet or artist; craftsman/farmer; sophist; tyrant); Pl. *Prot.* 316d1–e3 (poets, prophets, athletics, music); Pl. *Resp.* 369b5–370a4 (farmer, house-builder, weaver, cobbler and doctor); Pl. *Gorg.* 464b (δικαιοσύνη, νομοθετική, γυμναστική, ἱατρική).

complex and well-advanced in Athens during Plato's lifetime in the fifth and fourth centuries, where Harris and Lewis have identified up to 200 occupations.⁶⁴ Any skill could potentially earn one a livelihood: Socrates in Xenophon's *Symposium* (4.60) praises the art of pandering (μαστροπεία), which would allow him to charge large fees.

Specialization and professionalization can, I suggest, to some extent explain the tendency of poets and other workers to travel. Professional skill facilitates travel because it is a portable commodity often widely in demand. The prospect of material reward at Panhellenic contests and from patrons creates an incentive to move. The need for professionals to regularly practise their art or trade constitutes an additional motive. In some cases one locality may not provide enough work to sustain a regular occupation. This has obvious financial implications for anyone who depends upon a profession for a living, yet it may also affect those who, though economically independent, wish to fully develop and demonstrate their abilities. In the case of poets, regular performances outside their home cities maintained their competitive edge and, if successful, provided them with an international reputation. The frequency of performances and the diversity of the audiences in these multifarious locations directly affected the extent of the poet's fame. The twin aims of renown and wealth are complementary: greater success and an increased reputation meant more prizes and more lucrative commissions, all of which could require travel.

We should, however, acknowledge some caveats. First, not all of these considerations need have applied in every case and, as we will see, some poets achieved all, or enough, of these aims by remaining in one location or region. The experience of the individual poet will have been dictated in part by personal circumstances. Yet, while allowing for exceptions, there is nonetheless a demonstrable tendency for poets of the archaic and classical periods to travel. An awareness of professionalism provides a tool with which to understand this pattern of behaviour. Second, we should not underestimate the differences between modern and ancient specialized labour. Professions undoubtedly increase in number and complexity over time in line with economic growth and technological advancement. Historians have tended, understandably, to be wary of employing a modern term

⁶⁴ See E.M. Harris (2002) 88–99; E.M. Harris and Lewis (2016) 24–5, n. 123.

such as ‘professionalism’, which has no exact parallel in Greek or Latin. Despite a growing interest in the interplay between money and poetry and the commercial aspects of Greek festivals, it is rarely acknowledged that tragic poets were professionals.⁶⁵ There has been even less interest in Greek literary patronage.⁶⁶ The once common assumption that professionalism was a modern phenomenon, which only appeared after the Industrial Revolution, may have contributed to this neglect.⁶⁷

Yet specialist skills and occupations are generally found in all societies, regardless of their level of industrialization.⁶⁸ Research on early-modern Europe—and England in particular—has over the past three decades steadily demolished the view that professionalism is inherently linked to industrialization.⁶⁹ Differences in the form and organization of skilled labour are often more quantitative than qualitative. Medicine, for example, was as much a specialist occupation in the ancient as in the modern world. From the late Bronze Age skilled doctors, especially those from Egypt and Babylon, were so highly in demand that they were regularly imported to Hatti and other kingdoms and even, on occasion, detained there against their will.⁷⁰ The principal difference is that modern medicine encompasses within it numerous specialist disciplines, since medical knowledge has so far increased that the individual cannot be expected to attain equal mastery over every branch of expertise. The point at issue is thus not whether or to what extent ancient skilled labour resembled modern professions; rather it is how forms of specialist skill affected the activities, identity and status of workers in antiquity.

⁶⁵ An exception is Duncan (2011) 80, who characterizes Euripides’ visit to Macedonia as an example of a tragic poet ‘following the market’; cf. Seaford (2011). On ancient money and society see Seaford (2004) and Le Guen (2010a). On the financial outlay necessary to hold a dramatic festival see Wilson (2008); (2010). Musical professionalism, when it has been considered, is often thought of as a late development, occurring from the mid to late fifth century: e.g. Bowie (2009), (2012); for a full discussion see Stewart (2016b).

⁶⁶ According to Millett (1989) 15, ‘a bibliography on the subject of patronage in the ancient Greek world would be brief almost to the point of non-existence’; the situation has not greatly changed since. See also Gold (1987) 8–16; Alwine (2016). For the patronage of epinician poets see Morgan (2007).

⁶⁷ Larson (2013) xxiv, 2–7.

⁶⁸ e.g. Martin (2006) 160 compares the list of occupations in Solon fr. 13.43–6 West with the tendency of the Kuna people of San Blas, Panama, to catalogue the members of their communities by occupation.

⁶⁹ See e.g. Prest (1987) esp. 1–19.

⁷⁰ Zaccagnini (1983); cf. the case of Democedes in Hdt. 3.131–8.

3. THE ARGUMENT

This book attempts to explain why Greek tragedy was Greek in the classical and archaic period. It makes three main claims. The first is that tragedy as a genre was Panhellenic in its subject matter. The myths selected and adapted by tragedians not only concerned a multitude of different Greek communities; they also developed and explained the connections between the various Hellenic tribes through narratives of travel. The argument for such an understanding of tragedy is made primarily in Chapter 1. It is further argued in Chapters 4 and 5 that a number of plays performed outside Athens in the fifth century were similarly designed to link the mythological traditions of local communities into a wider Panhellenic narrative.

Second, tragedy developed out of a longstanding Panhellenic 'song culture'. By the archaic period a network of festivals was already in place that extended across the Greek world. This encouraged and facilitated regular travel and the exchange of stories, music, and ideas. The development and workings of this network is considered in Chapter 2. The position of Athens within the festival circuit, and its ability to attract foreign performers and spectators, is considered in Chapter 3. Due to Athens' status as a gathering place for the Greeks as a whole, the dissemination of a tragedy may be said to have begun at the moment of its first performance in the theatre of Dionysus.

Third, tragedy was on the move along this network from an early period. Travel had been an integral part of the work of the professional poet from at least the seventh century; the tragic poets would follow the same patterns of behaviour as their predecessors and contemporaries. In Chapter 3 we see that Athens not only produced tragedians, it also hosted dramatic performers from other cities. The traffic in poetry, as in other goods, went in two directions, both into and out from the harbours and gates of the city. Chapters 4, 5, and 6 concern the travels of tragic poets and actors outside Athens during the fifth and fourth centuries. As the Greeks themselves moved from gathering to gathering, so tragedy was carried with them. In the process, it became an integral part of the Hellenic song culture from which it had originally emerged.

The Background I

Travelling Heroes and Panhellenic Tragedy

INTRODUCTION

In the following two chapters we will review the background to the dissemination of tragedy. The two factors that enabled plays to spread quickly across the Greek world are (1) the Panhellenic content of the myths dramatized in tragedy and (2) the pre-existing networks of festivals and patrons that tragic poets both employed and augmented on their travels. What emerges is a continually expanding web of interconnections between communities and locations. The contribution of tragic poets to this Panhellenic network will be considered in later chapters.

Here we will examine the ways in which the content of tragedy may be described as Panhellenic. First, tragedy takes as its subject matter myths that were well known to the Greeks as a whole, particularly those told in the works attributed to Homer. Second, these myths are Panhellenic in the sense that they do not concern any one city or community, but instead collectively tell the story of the Greek nation in its entirety. Finally, myth, as told in individual tragedies, frequently makes connections between different locations. This is achieved particularly through accounts of mythical journeys. In dramatizing the tales of long-dead heroes, tragedy created a common past for its contemporary and Panhellenic audience.

1. THE TRAVELLING HERO IN GREEK POETRY

Many of the myths of the Greeks, like the poets themselves, have their origins in one particular city. However, if we look more closely, we often see that these myths form part of an overarching matrix that ties one god or hero to many different locations. Even myths that apparently concern the fate of one *polis*, such as Troy, are in fact the stories of great journeys. Troy is a destination on a circuit, where men must win fame through suffering before embarking on their return. The journey home (*νόστος*) is itself a trial in its own right, as well as one element of a broader myth. When we consider Greek myth in its entirety, we quickly come to realize that this 'circuit', what Kurke has termed the 'loop of *nostos*', is a pervasive element.¹ Moreover, we shall see that heroes are driven to travel by the same twin motives of fame and material gain that inspired the historical Greeks themselves, including the poets who crafted these myths.

In the fifth century, the Theban poet Pindar indicates that his heroes are almost compelled to leave their homes by their desire to display their prowess. They go in search of contests (*ἄεθλοι*) that will demonstrate their excellence (*ἀρετή*) and thereby bring them fame.² To stay 'sitting' at home is the mark of a coward who wins only an old age in obscurity.³ A great danger, Pelops tells Poseidon, does not take hold of cowards (*Ol.* 1.81)—the danger in question being the perilous contest with Oenomaus. It is by taking risks on great expeditions that men prove themselves. In the case of the Argonauts, the desire for fame is equally a stimulus for leaving home. Their voyage was celebrated in Pindar's fourth *Pythian*. Jason assembles the greatest heroes of his age, who are driven by a passion not to be left behind at home in safety with their mothers (185–6) but to endure toil (*πόνος*, 178; cf. *Ol.* 5.15–16), and so accomplish great deeds and win a glorious return. In offering an opportunity for distinction the quest becomes a salve for their excellence (*φάρμακον κάλλιστον ἑὸς ἀρετᾶς*, 187). The need to win fame propels the Argonauts towards their distant contest.

¹ Kurke (1991) 15–34; she notes Pindar's frequent sea-faring metaphors; e.g. *Ol.* 12.5–6, 11–12; *Nem.* 6.26, *Isth.* 4.5–6. On travelling metaphors in Pindar see Steiner (1986) 76–86. On the theme of *νόστος* in myth see Alexopoulou (2009).

² Pindar uses the term to refer to the race of Pelops (*Ol.* 1.84), the expedition of the Argo (*Pyth.* 4.165 and 220; cf. *Mimn. fr.* 11.3 West), Heracles' Labours (*Isthm.* 6.48). The uncontracted form is also used by Homer except at *Od.* 8.160.

³ *καθήμενος*, *Ol.* 1.83; Gerber (1982) 128.

A hero may secure his fame by returning successfully from his journeys and enjoying the fruits of his labour: glory, as well as more tangible rewards. Odysseus, 'the man of many ways, who saw many cities of men' gains, from his constant movement, a fame that is said to 'reach the heavens' (*Od.* 1–3; 9.20). Heracles, after his death at the end of his labours, feasts with Hebe and the gods.⁴ The hero may also accrue wealth from his travels. This is especially evident in the case of Odysseus. The gifts from Scheria given to Odysseus after ten years of wandering turn out to be more valuable even than the riches taken from Troy after ten years of war (*Od.* 13.135–8).

If a hero must leave home to gain fame, then the greatest heroes are often those who go the furthest. The wanderings of Odysseus extend from the inner lands known to the Greeks outwards to the distant Ocean encircling the world.⁵ Another inveterate traveller, and most Panhellenic of heroes, was Heracles.⁶ His particular pre-eminence was set by his pillars by the Ocean, which he established as 'witnesses to the extent of his glorious voyage'.⁷ Together with the Black Sea, which was the destination for the voyage of the Argo, the pillars of Heracles were seen as the outer limits of the world known to the Greeks, and thus the limits of human achievement.⁸

The home and city to which the hero returned could claim much of the reflected glory, but so too could the cities in which he carried out his labours. The possibilities for adding stories, participants, and locations to established mythical cycles were practically limitless. Individual heroes are often claimed by more than one city: Heracles is a native of Thebes (by birth), Argos (by descent), and the father of numerous peoples including the Spartans and Macedonians. Even a cursory survey of the odes of Pindar suggests a wealth of potential mythical associations. The island of Aegina is linked to the Trojan cycle by the exile of Peleus and Telamon; Rhodes is connected with

⁴ e.g. *Od.* 11. 601–6; Pind. *Nem.* 1.72; Soph. *Phil.* 1418–22.

⁵ On Ocean see *Il.* 18.607–8, *Od.* 11.13–22, 12.1–2; the remoteness of the lands Odysseus visits is continually stressed, e.g. *Od.* 5.100–1; 6.203–5. Montiglio (2005) 8–10 divides the world of Odysseus into four concentric zones. She argues that wanderers are confined to the outer zones; cf. West (2005) 40–5 = (2011a) 278–86.

⁶ See Stafford (2012) 23–78.

⁷ *ναυτιλίας ἐσχάτας / μάρτυρας κλυτὰς* Pind. *Nem.* 3.22–3. The crossing of Ocean was an early feature of the myth of the labour of the cattle of Geryon as related by Hesiod (*διαβὰς πόρον Ὠκεανοῖο*, *Theog.* 292) and Stesichorus (fr. 8a Finglass); compare the description of Colchis e.g. Mimn. fr. 11 and 11a West.

⁸ Eur. *Hipp.* 3–4; Pl. *Phd.* 109b; see E. Hall (2013) 60.

the Heraclids of Argos by the flight of Tlepolemus; the origins of Cyrene extend back to the voyage of the Argo; the beginnings of the Syracusan stream Arethusa are found in the Peloponnesian Alpheus.⁹

Disparate Greek communities wanted to link their own cities and locations to a broader Panhellenic story. Poets enabled them to do so and, furthermore, invented or adapted myths to suit the needs and ambitions of the communities they visited. The experience of poets may have been similar to that of the fifth-century sophist Hippias, who, in a dialogue attributed to Plato, claims to have memorized the genealogies of heroes and the accounts of the foundation of cities in order to satisfy the demand of the Spartans for such information.¹⁰ We need not be surprised if elsewhere Hippias is described as visiting Olympia with a collection of poems that included tragedies (Pl. *Hipp. Min.* 368c8).

2. PANHELLENIC TRAGEDY

Historicist approaches to tragedy have tended to focus on those plays that are set in Athens, involve Athenian heroes, and appear to concern or comment on Athenian issues. Most prominent among these is Aeschylus' *Eumenides*, which dramatized the foundation of the Athenian Areopagus and may or may not have commented on its reform in the 460s.¹¹ When plays do not directly concern Athens, it is the comparison between Athens and other cities that often excites most comment. Zeitlin, for example, has argued that Thebes in the *Oedipus at Colonus* is an 'anti-Athens', an example of everything

⁹ Aegina: *Ol.* 8.30–46, *Pyth.* 8.98–100, *Nem.* 3.28–64, 4.54–72, 5.14–16; Rhodes: *Ol.* 7.20–33; Cyrene: *Pyth.* 4; Arethusa: *Nem.* 1.1–2. The earliest reference to Alpheus' subterranean passage to Syracuse is Ibycus fr. 323 *PMGF*; cf. Σ Pind. *Nem.* 1.1–3 (Drachmann III pp. 7–10), Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 2.12a (Drachmann II p. 33); Paus. 5.7.2–3, *Ov. Met.* 5.572–641 and Serv. *Verg. Ecl.* 10.4. The myth was intimately connected with the foundation of Syracuse: Paus. 5.7.3. See Braswell (1992) 33–4.

¹⁰ Pl. *Hipp. Mai.* 285d6–e2 *περὶ τῶν γενῶν, ὃ Σώκρατες, τῶν τε ἡρώων καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν κατοικήσεων, ὡς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐκτίσθησαν αἱ πόλεις, καὶ συλλήβδην πάσης τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας ἥδιστα ἀκροῶνται, ὥστ' ἔγωγε δι' αὐτοὺς ἡνάγκασμαι ἐκμεμαθηκέναι τε καὶ ἐκμεμελετηκέναι πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα.*

¹¹ See e.g. Dodds (1960); Podlecki (1966) 81–100; Macleod (1982); Sommerstein (1989) 31–2.

Athens is not.¹² Others have viewed heroes such as Oedipus or Ajax as allegories for Athens or Athenian statesmen.¹³ The Athenian *dēmos*, we are to be led to believe, is continually scanning the plays for allusions to itself.¹⁴

These approaches are certainly justified when applied to particular plays. In addition to the *Eumenides*, three other plays—Sophocles' *Oedipus at Colonus*, Euripides' *Heraclidae* and *Suppliants*—are set in Attica, concern Theseus or his sons, and praise Athens and her values. There is one additional play celebrating the achievements of contemporary Athens (Aeschylus *Persians*) and five more that include Attic heroes as *dramatis personae* (Sophocles' *Ajax*, Euripides' *Hippolytus*, *Heracles*, *Medea*, and *Ion*). Eight further plays refer to the arrival of the non-Athenian heroes Oedipus and Orestes in Attica or include brief flattering allusions to Athens.¹⁵ Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* in particular provides aetiologies for drinking customs at the Anthesteria (947–60) and the Attic cults of Artemis at Halae Araphenides and Brauron (1448–72).¹⁶ The fragments of tragedy provide us with information regarding fifteen other plays either certainly or probably

¹² Zeitlin (1986) 116, 140–1 = (1990) 144; 166–7; cf. Zeitlin (1993). Her views have been challenged by Finglass (2012a), who points in particular to the positive presentation of Thebes in Soph. *OC* 919–23, and Roselli (2011) 144.

¹³ e.g. Rosenbloom (2011) 357: tragedies 'construct "Athens" and "Athenians" as synechdoches for "Hellas" and "Hellenes"'. Oedipus: see Knox (1954) and (1957) 53–106; Ajax: Rose (1995) and Scodel (2003); see also Bradshaw (1991) 114–15 and 123, who interprets Ajax as 'an Athenian agonist, not only in that he embodies traditional values, but also in that he confronts the problems of redefinition which the contemporary *polis* was addressing'. For a similar approach see Michelakis (2002) 22, who claims that Aeschylus 'recasts' Achilles as 'an early fifth century aristocrat' in his *Myrmidons*. Griffin (1999b) 83–9 and Finglass (2005), however, reject such suggestions of political allegory in Sophocles; cf. Finglass (2011) 9–10 n. 30, who compares parallels made between Ajax and Athenian demagogues with (now disputed) allegorical interpretations of Pindar.

¹⁴ e.g. Morwood (2009) 355 on Eur. *Supp.* 399–46: 'This particular scene would clearly have had strong political resonances for a contemporary Athenian audience.' See also Osborne (1994) 57–8 = (2010) 36, who states that 'issues that led a theatre audience to react would be precisely those to which the Athenian citizen body as a whole would react . . . we should therefore expect Athenian drama to offer a mirror to the whole Athenian world in a way in which no modern drama could be expected to.'

¹⁵ Oedipus: Eur. *Phoen.* 1705–7; Orestes: *El.* 1254, *IT*, *Orestes* 1648; praise of Athens: Eur. *Hec.* 466–74; *Tro.* 31, 218–19, and [Eur.] *Rhes.* 941–7; Soph. *Ant.* 966–87 refers to the offspring of the Athenian Erechtheid Oreithyia in Thrace, while 1116–25 contain a brief mention of the cult of Dionysus at Eleusis, along with the god's seats in Italy and Thebes.

¹⁶ On the play and its relationship with the cult of Artemis see E. Hall (2013) xxix–xxx.

set in Athens.¹⁷ Theseus, the archetypal Athenian hero, was an important subject for tragedians, while plays concerning other early kings of Attica, such as Triptolemus and Erechtheus, are also represented. We know of a further fifteen plays that were certainly or probably set outside Attica but involved Athenian heroes.¹⁸

More recent studies, however, have focused on Panhellenic elements in tragedy, with ‘Panhellenism’ understood principally as an expression of Athenian hegemony, broadcast to the wider Greek world.¹⁹ Tragedy, it is argued, plays a part in international as well as domestic politics.²⁰ Athens is therefore inseparable from the broader context of the community of the Greeks, in which it is first among equals. Such a Panhellenic orientation can be demonstrated even in those plays judged most ‘Athenocentric’. In Aeschylus’ *Persians*, for example, Athens’ achievement at Salamis is echoed by that of Sparta at Plataea.²¹ In the *Eumenides*, the Areopagus is unique only because it is the first homicide court, and therefore a model to other communities who pride themselves on good order, such as the Spartans in the Peloponnese.²² Euripides claimed that the daughters

¹⁷ See the full list in Appendix 1.

¹⁸ Euripides’ *Theseus* (fr. 381–90 TrGF; cf. Tiiia = P.Oxy. 4640 col. i.1–18), *Sciron* (fr. 674a–81 TrGF; cf. Apollod. *Epit.* 1.2) and the lost *Hippolytus* (fr. 428–47 TrGF; T.iib.15 = P.Mich. 6222a) concerned Theseus’ adventures in the Megaris, Crete, and Troezen respectively. Sophocles’ *Daedalus* (fr. 161–64a TrGF) and *Camici* (fr. 323–7 TrGF) narrate the adventures of Daedalus, the latter of which appears to have contained an allusion to Daedalus’ Athenian origins (Soph. fr. 323 TrGF). Euneus, the founder of the Attic Euneidae, appeared as a character in Euripides’ *Hypsipyle* (fr. 752–70 TrGF); on the ‘purposeful Atticisation’ of this myth, see Cropp (2003) 137. Procne and Philomela, daughters of Pandion of Athens, featured in Sophocles’ *Tereus* (fr. 581–95 TrGF) and in a tetralogy by Philocles (fr. 1 TrGF). The rape of another Athenian woman, Oreithyia the daughter of Erechtheus, by Boreas was the subject of Sophocles’ *Drummers* (fr. 636–45 TrGF) and was possibly alluded to in Aeschylus’ *Phineus* (see Ch. 4.2.b). Finally, the history of contemporary Athens appears to have featured in two plays by Phrynichus, the *Sack of Miletus* (Hdt. 6.21) and *Phoenician Women* (fr. 8 TrGF), which like Aeschylus’ *Persians* concerned the conflict between Greece and Persia.

¹⁹ Zacharia (2003) 74: ‘the context [of tragedy] is more imperial than domestic’; Rosenbloom (2011) 357: tragedy fulfilled a ‘function of Athenian imperialism’; cf. Carter (2004) 10–13; (2007) 6–8; 42–3.

²⁰ e.g. Kowalzig (2008), who sets Aeschylus’ visit to Syracuse and his play the *Aetnaeae* in the context of Athens’s desire to secure a supply of grain from the Greek West; cf. Kowalzig (2013), where the grain trade is seen as providing a similar explanation for the Black Sea setting of the *Iphigenia in Tauris*.

²¹ See Ch. 4.2.b.

²² οἶον οὐτὶς ἀνθρώπων ἔχει, | οὐτ’ ἐν Σκύθῃσιν οὔτε Πέλοπος ἐν τόποις, 702–3.

of Erechtheus would be famous in all of Greece as the Hyacinthids and, as such, would be honoured with hero cult and maiden dances.²³ This celebration seems to have mirrored the Spartan Hyacinthia, which, like its less well-known Attic equivalent, involved maiden choruses.²⁴ Such myths demonstrated Athens' contribution to the Panhellenic community, so that, as Visvardi argues in her study of the choral odes of Euripides, 'Athenocentrism is juxtaposed with Panhellenism.'²⁵

Yet while praise of Athens within a Panhellenic context was a feature of some tragedies, it was very far from being a function of the genre as a whole. Moreover, Panhellenism in tragedy should refer to more than just assertions of Athenian hegemony. Out of the extant plays, the seventeen listed above which have any connection to Athens at all, however tenuous, represent only 48 per cent out of thirty-two tragedies and one satyr play. If we exclude passing references to Athens in six plays the figure drops to 33 per cent.

When the fragments of tragedy are taken into account, the proportion of plays set in or connected to Athens could have been even smaller. There are 218 tragedies and satyr dramas about which enough is known to make their settings certain or highly likely (see Table 1.1). This figure also includes plays about which little is known other than the title but which dramatized myths associated with only one location. A majority of these plays are inevitably represented by the works of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides. Most, if not all, were performed at Athens in either the fifth or fourth centuries. The nineteen plays that were certainly or probably set in Attica represent just under 9 per cent of the total. If we add the intact and fragmentary plays set in Athens to those involving Athenian subjects, we arrive at a total of forty-eight plays, which accounts for 22 per cent. In other words, the proportion of plays appearing on the Athenian stage and elsewhere with no ostensible connection to Attica could potentially have been as high as 80 per cent.²⁶ And the myths that appeared most

²³ ὄνομα δὲ κλεινὸν θήσσομαι κα[θ'] Ἑλλάδα, Eur. fr. 370.73 TrGF.

²⁴ Athens: Eur. fr. 370.80 TrGF; cf. Parker (2005) 399 and 446; Sparta: Eur. Hel. 445–52; Athen. 139d–f = Polycrates *FGrHist* 588 F 1; see Pettersson (1992) 9–12. Apollod. 3.15.8 reconciles the two accounts of the origins of the Hyacinthids by making them the daughter of a Spartan immigrant sacrificed to save Athens.

²⁵ e.g. on Triptolemus see Isoc. 4.28–9; Xen. *Hell.* 6.36; quotation: Visvardi (2011) 277.

²⁶ Compare the judgement of Bremer (1991) 58: 'the poets chose an Attic myth as a subject for their play on the average only in one out of ten cases.'

Table 1.1. The settings of plays of Greek tragedy

Location	Number of certain plays	Number of probable plays	Total	%
Aegean and the Greek cities of Asia Minor	14	6	20	9.2
Argos and the Argolis	21	5	26	11.9
Attica	16	3	19	8.7
Boeotia	19	4	23	10.6
Central Greece (excluding Boeotia)	7	0	7	3.2
Corinthia and the Megaris	6	1	7	3.2
The Greek West	5	0	5	2.3
The Ionian Sea: Ithaca	2	1	3	1.4
Non Greek Locations	20	5	25	11.5
The Peloponnese (excluding the Argolis and Corinthia)	8	2	10	4.6
Thessaly	9	2	11	5.0
Thrace / Macedonia	6	15	21	9.6
Troad	33	8	41	18.8
Total	165	53	218	100

frequently at Athens are broadly the same as those which found favour outside Attica. As Vahtikari has recently shown, there is a strong correlation between the subject matter of known tragedies and the myths depicted on fourth century vase paintings from the Greek West.²⁷ Tragedy, when taken as a whole, thus gives an account of the origins and deeds of the entire Greek race, of which Athens formed only one part, however significant that part may have been.

The content of the genre of tragedy as a whole drew its subject matter from a variety of mythical traditions involving locations from across the Greek world and beyond. As is evident from Table 1.1, all parts of the world known to the Greeks are represented. Plays concerning Argos, Thebes, Troy and their environs are particularly popular, but even when taken together they only account for just over 40 per cent. The prominence of myths associated with these three cities attests to the importance of Homer and the epic cycle as sources of influence. As many as forty-two plays were set in the Troad and many others detail events prior to and following the Trojan War. Works such as Aeschylus' Trojan trilogy of *Myrmidons* (fr. 131–42 *TrGF*), *Nereids* (fr. 150–4 *TrGF*), and *Phrygians* (fr. 263–72 *TrGF*) dramatized scenes from the *Iliad*, while Aeschylus' *Penelope* (fr. 187

²⁷ Vahtikari (2014) 208–10.

TrGF), Sophocles' *Nausicaa* (frr. 439–41 TrGF), and Euripides' *Cyclops* drew directly on the *Odyssey*. As such, tragedians were adapting Panhellenic myths that had already been thoroughly disseminated among the Greeks by the end of the sixth century. The subject matter of tragedy, at least, would have been familiar and accessible to most, if not all, Greeks.

Tragedy may also be viewed as Panhellenic in the sense that it creates connections between different local traditions. This was recognized by André Bernand in his study of the 'geography' of tragedy in 1985, in which he argued that the diverse settings of tragedies provided a link between audiences spread across the Greek world.²⁸ One result of this, he claimed, was that tragedy was comprehensible to all Greeks.²⁹ Though his study may be to some extent overly narrow in focusing only on the extant tragedies, Bernand's book deserves more attention than it has generally received from students of tragedy.

The interconnections mapped out on 'la carte du tragique' (to use Bernand's term) are created by travel. Tragedy shares with epic and lyric poetry a fascination with heroic travel. Edith Hall has characterized Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris* as 'travel tragedy', but the term may equally well apply to the genre as a whole.³⁰ These journeys are, again, often extensive. At least twenty-five plays, or over 11 per cent, are set in barbarian lands. Some of these are envisioned as the outer-limits of the earth, such as Scythia where Prometheus is tied to a rock on the edge of Ocean.³¹ While Prometheus is stationary throughout the play, the Argive Io is embarking on a lengthy journey through these outer regions (γῆς ἐπ' ἐσχάτοις ὄροις, 666). Her circumambulation of the earth will only end in the equally remote land of Egypt—as is outlined in the prophecy by Prometheus (707–815). The return journey will be made generations later by Io's descendants, the

²⁸ Bernand (1985) 22: 'le géographie... pourra peut-être nous faire découvrir le lien tragique établi par les poètes entre toutes les cités du monde grec.'

²⁹ Bernand (1985) 21: 'les dramaturges ont cherché et trouvé un langage qui fût compris de tous ceux qui n'étaient pas "barbares", c'est-à-dire de tous ceux qui parlaient grec.'

³⁰ E. Hall (2013) 47–68; cf. Kowalzig (2013) 179 who similarly argues that the *Iphigenia in Tauris* demonstrates the existence of a 'transcultural chorality' that 'was central to the cognitive processes underlying the establishment of economic ties to the Pontos in the late fifth century Athenian empire'.

³¹ *Χθονὸς μὲν εἰς τηλουρόν ἤκομεν πέδον, | Σκύθην ἐς οἶμον, [Aesch.] PV 1–2; καὶ Σκύθης ὄμιλος, οἱ γὰρ | ἔσχατον τόπον ἀμφὶ Μαί- | ῶτιν ἔχουσι λίμναν, 417–19.*

daughters of Danaus, whose arrival in Argos was the subject of Aeschylus' Danaid trilogy (cf. *Supp.* 274–322). Other Greek travellers to distant lands frequently represented in tragedy include the Argonauts, Telephus (whose journey from Arcadia to Mysia was the subject of Aeschylus and Sophocles' *Mysians*), Niobe (wife of Amphion, who in Sophocles' *Niobe* returned from Thebes to Lydia after the destruction of her family), and Perseus (who saved Andromeda in Ethiopia according to Euripides', and probably Sophocles', version of the myth).³² These wanderings, like those of Odysseus in epic, serve to link the centre of the recognizable Greek world to its imagined periphery.

Tragedy tends to dwell on the negative effects of travel and the 'push' (rather than 'pull') factors that compelled heroes to leave their homes against their will. The genre is replete with stories of exiles.³³ Polyneices in Euripides' *Phoenician Women* (388–9) characterizes the loss of one's fatherland as a great evil. His assessment would seem to be vindicated by the sufferings of the wandering beggars who appeared so frequently in the plays of Euripides that they came to be seen as a stock feature of his oeuvre. Aristophanes (*Ach.* 418–30) mentions as examples Oeneus, Phoenix, Philoctetes, Bellerophon, and Telephus, all of whom were forced to leave their homes. Some, like Polyneices, Oeneus, Phoenix, and Teucer, were driven out by the anger or injustice of family members.³⁴ Others, like Alcmeon, Bellerophon, Orestes, and Oedipus, were expelled at the command of the gods as polluted scapegoats.³⁵ Diogenes the Cynic seems to have

³² Argonauts: ἐπ' ἐσχάτοις τόποις, Soph. *Trach.* 1100, cf. Eur. *Med.* 540–1; Telephus' journey: Arist. *Poet.* 1460a27–32; Mysian setting: Aesch. frs. 143, 144, Soph. frs. 411, 412 *TrGF*; Niobe: Σ *Il.* 24.602; cf. Eust. *Il.* 1367.20; Andromeda: [Eratosth.] *Cat.* 15–16; Eur. fr. 145 *TrGF*.

³³ Bernand (1985) 15: 'le héros tragique est essentiellement défini comme un vagabond, un Grec errant, le plus grand malheur de l'homme étant le déracinement'; see also Bernand full discussion on pp. 327–62.

³⁴ Oeneus: the exile of Oeneus by his brother Agrius formed part of Euripides *Oeneus* (Σ *Ar. Ach.* 418a Holwerda I 1b p. 64); Phoenix: see *Il.* 9.447–9; Phoenix's departure was dramatized by Euripides (fr. 817 *TrGF*), and conceivably also by Sophocles (frs. 718–20 *TrGF*) and Ion (frs. 38–43 *TrGF*), though nothing is known of the plot of these plays. Teucer: on the anger of Telamon see Soph. *Aj.* 1008–10; Eur. *Hel.* 90–2; Σ Pind. *Nem.* 4.76 (Drachmann III p. 76); this seems to have formed a part of Sophocles' *Teucer* (see fr. 577 *TrGF*, in which Telamon may address Teucer).

³⁵ Alcmeon's wanderings after the death of Eriphyle were recounted in Euripides' *Alcmeon in Corinth* (frs. 65–73 *TrGF*), *Alcmeon in Psophis* (73a–77), and Theodectas' *Alcmeon* (frs. 1a–2 *TrGF*). Bellerophon: for his initial flight from Corinth to Tiryns see Euripides *Stheneboea* fr. 661.16–17 *TrGF*; his later wanderings in Lycia formed the

summed up the genre well when he claimed to be afflicted by the tragic curses:

ἄπολις, ἄοικος, πατρίδος ἔστερημένος,
πτωχός, πλανήτης, βίον ἔχων ἐφήμερον.

Without a city, homeless, deprived of my fatherland,
I am a beggar, a wanderer, possessed of an ephemeral livelihood.³⁶

Tragic heroes almost belong on the road beyond the established city; yet their travels also build links between cities and localities. To take one example, Athamas the son of Aeolus is associated with both Boeotia and Thessaly. He is best known for nearly sacrificing his own son Phrixus through the intrigues of his second wife Ino. Euripides wrote two plays entitled *Phrixus* (labelled A and B in *TrGF*): both covered the same story, but one was set in Thessaly and the other in Boeotia. The myth was also told in two dramas entitled *Athamas* by Sophocles (fr. 1–10 *TrGF*) and one by Aeschylus (1–4a), although the settings of these plays are unknown. Apollodorus (1.9.1–2) claims that Athamas ruled over Boeotia but was forced to flee to Thessaly after the madness of Ino and the deaths of her children. This may to some extent follow Euripides' *Phrixus* B, which makes Athamas a king in Orchomenus at the time of Phrixus' escape.³⁷ Athamas' marriage to Ino, daughter of the Theban founder Cadmus, made a Boeotian setting attractive and it is this lineage that is discussed in the opening lines of the play (fr. 819). However, the setting of *Phrixus* A in Thessaly was made equally possible by the fact that Athamas was the son of Aeolus son of Hellen, who is commonly located in Thessaly.³⁸ Furthermore, according to Herodotus (7.197), the story of Athamas and Phrixus was associated with the sanctuary of Zeus Laphystius at Halus in Thessaly by the time of Xerxes' invasion. This same cult of Zeus Laphystius is also found in Boeotia near Coronea, and it may be that as the cult travelled so did the myth of Athamas.³⁹ A tragic poet could either

subject of Euripides *Bellerophon* (Tiia *TrGF* = *P.Oxy.* 3651.20; cf. *Il.* 6.200–2); Oedipus: Soph. OC 440–4.

³⁶ Diogenes fr. 4 *TrGF* = Diog. Laert. 6.38; for similar passages in tragedy see e.g. Soph. OC 344–52; Eur. *Med.* 252–8; *Phoen.* 400–5.

³⁷ Ἀθάμας ἐν Ὀρχομενῶ βασιλευσιν, Tiia.4 *TrGF* = *P.Oxy.* 2455.270.

³⁸ Ἀθάμας υἱὸς μεῖν ἦν Αἰόλου, βασιλεὺς | δὲ Θεσσαλίας Tiia.4–5 *TrGF* = *P.Oxy.* 2455.224–5.

³⁹ Paus. 9.34.5; see Schachter (1994) 107–8.

choose to side with one of these rival traditions, or, as was the case with Apollodorus, to reconcile the inherent contradictions by sending Athamas on a journey from Boeotia to Thessaly.

The varying accounts of Athamas' origins tie into a wider story of migration and specifically the tradition that the Boeotians had previously lived in Thessaly.⁴⁰ The foundation of cities and shrines as a result of such migration was a popular theme in tragedy. The exile of a hero commonly leads to the settlement of another land. The establishment of Salamis on Cyprus, for example, was the result of Teucer's exile, as narrated in Euripides' *Helen* (146–50). The instruction to found a city is commonly received in the *deus ex machina* oration following the trauma of the play's main action. This was true of Euripides' *Andromache*, where Thetis predicts that the son of Neoptolemus and Andromache will found a line of Molossian kings.⁴¹ Euripides' *Alcmeon in Corinth* and Xenocles' *Licymnius* may have had similar endings in predicting the founding of Amphilocheian Argos and the settling of Rhodes respectively.⁴² Other possible examples, including Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae*, Euripides' *Archelaus* and *Captive Melanippe*, will be discussed in Chapters 4 and 5.

Finally, a not inconsiderable number of tragedies dramatize myths connected with Panhellenic sanctuaries. Myths concerning all of the four main sites on the Panhellenic *periodos*—Olympia, Delphi, Isthmia, and Nemea—appear in tragedy. Most obviously these include aetiologies for the athletic games held at these sites: the race of Pelops and Oenomaus at Olympia and the death of Opheltes at Nemea.⁴³ The role of such centres as meeting places for the Greek nation as a whole is strongly emphasized. Euripides' *Ion* situates the

⁴⁰ Thuc. 1.12.3; Strabo 9.2.3.

⁴¹ See Ch. 5.2.

⁴² Euripides: Apollod. 3.7.7; Xenocles: fr. 2 TrGF; cf. *Σ Nub.* 1264–5 (Holwerda I 3.1 p. 229); on Tlepolemus' flight to Rhodes after killing Licymnius see *Il.* 2.653–70; Pind. *Ol.* 7.20–33.

⁴³ Olympia: Tragedies entitled *Oenomaus* were written by Sophocles (see Sommerstein and Talbot (2012) 80 n. 24 on the setting) and Euripides; Nemea: Euripides *Hyppisyle* was set at Nemea (fr. 752f.29; 752h.10, 21; 757.108 TrGF) and celebrated the foundation of the games (on the myth see Bacchyl. 9.10–17; Simon. fr. 553 PMG and Pind. *Nem.* 8.51, 10.28; Cropp (2003) 133–4); this may also have formed the plot of Aeschylus' *Nemea* (fr. 149a TrGF); other games: satyrs appear as competitors at the Isthmia in Aeschylus' *Isthmian Competitors* (fr. 78a–94 TrGF); Orestes performs at the Pythian games (Soph. *El.* 680–763). Athletic contests in tragedy are specifically open to all peoples (ἀγῶνα πάγγενον, Soph. fr. 378.1; cf. ἀγῶνα πάνδημον, Eur. *Alc.* 1026).

revelation of the hero's identity at the 'common oracle of Greece' at Delphi.⁴⁴ The astonishment of travellers upon seeing the architectural and artistic wonders of such sanctuaries is expressed in the *Ion* (184–218) by the chorus of Athenian girls and by the sons of Hypsipyle at Nemea in Euripides' *Hypsipyle* (fr. 752c TrGF). Athenian festivals and rituals were included as part of this circuit. Of the nineteen plays believed to have been set in Attica, the action of seven takes place at Eleusis, an important destination for pilgrims from across the Greek world.⁴⁵ These include Sophocles' *Triptolemus*, which dramatized the bringing of Demeter's gift of grain from Eleusis to the world and included a lengthy speech detailing Triptolemus' route.⁴⁶ Once again Athens' proudest achievements are most apparent in a Panhellenic setting.

CONCLUSION

Tragedy, like much of Greek poetry in general, is an account of the origins, migrations, and settlements of a bewildering range of Greek peoples, together with their barbarian neighbours. The genre can be described as Panhellenic in the sense that, like epic and lyric, it takes as its subject the Greeks as a whole and explains who they were and where they came from. It remains to be seen whether this Panhellenic content was intended for a Panhellenic audience. 'Localizations', to use Taplin's term, are not enough on their own to prove that plays were performed outside Attica or watched by foreigners at the Athenian dramatic festivals. These are questions that will be

⁴⁴ *τρίποδα κοινὸν Ἑλλάδος*, 366; cf. 91–2. *Ion* describes the frequent arrival of strangers to the sanctuary (*ξένοι*, 640–1).

⁴⁵ On the 'Panhellenic prestige' of the Mysteries at Eleusis see Parker (2005) 327; on requests for tithes sent out to all the Greeks, see *IG* I³ 78.30–4; on the announcement of a truce to allow safe passage for foreigners to Eleusis at the time of the Mysteries see Aeschin. 2.133, *IG* I³ 6, and Parke (1977) 61–2; this truce was broken by the Aetolians in 367, who imprisoned the heralds sent from the sanctuary, 'contrary to the common laws of the Greeks' (*παρὰ τοὺς νόμους τ- | [ο]ὺς κοι[ν]οὺς τῶν Ἑλλήνων*, R–O 35.13–14).

⁴⁶ Soph. fr. 596–610 TrGF; see Sommerstein and Talboy (2012) 222–4.

discussed in subsequent chapters. Yet, we may reasonably assume at this stage that the audience of tragedy in classical Athens was familiar with and had a consuming passion for such myths. Moreover, it is probable that tragedy, like its heroes, was inherently suited for travel because of the nature of its content.

The Background II

Wandering Poets, Panhellenic Networks, and Professionalism

1. INTRODUCTION: MOBILITY IN ARCHAIC AND CLASSICAL GREECE

a. The Culture of Travel in Ancient Greece

The mythological landscape explored in the previous chapter was partly determined by the actual travel and geographical knowledge of historical Greeks. As the real Greek world expanded, the boundaries of the mythical moved to incorporate new lands and peoples. The colonization of Italy and Sicily from the eighth century brought Odysseus to the West, while the youth of Dionysus and the punishment of Prometheus, which had previously been located in Lydia and Scythia respectively, moved to India with the conquests of Alexander.¹ And like the heroes of tragedy, the Greeks were themselves frequently on the move, both prior to and during the period of tragedy's development. It is this mobility that does much to explain not only the panhellenic outlook of tragedy, but also how Greek culture, and tragedy in particular, developed over the wide expanse of the Mediterranean and Black Sea.

Motivations for travel varied considerably. Much of this movement was involuntary, forced upon Greeks by political strife, war, and the not infrequent uprooting of whole cities and populations.² Where

¹ Lane Fox (2008) 180–8.

² Displaced persons: Garland (2014) 7–13, 114–49; on political exile in the archaic and classical city see Forsdyke (2005); on the literature of exile see Gaertner (2007).

human agency was lacking, hunger and poverty compelled others to seek a better life away from home.³ Yet still others voluntarily chose to travel for a variety of reasons. Athens, as a major economic centre in the fifth century, attracted large numbers of foreign workers who came to settle on a semi-permanent basis, partly because of the positive benefits on offer. At the end of the fourth century, after a period of decline, there were still as many as ten thousand non-Athenian permanent residents.⁴

In addition to migration, travel on an intermittent or regular basis between cities was also common. By the classical period Athens formed an important centre within a series of overlapping networks. Traders and merchants are likely to have accounted for a sizable proportion of the occasional visitors to Athens and other cities.⁵ The traders of Samos and Aegina, mentioned by Herodotus, allegedly travelled further than any other Greeks before their day, even as far as the Pillars of Heracles and beyond.⁶ Official embassies between cities and panhellenic sanctuaries were also taking place on a regular basis. One word for embassy (*θεωρία*) can also be used to refer to pilgrimage: a network studied in detail by Ian Rutherford.⁷ Pilgrims travelled not only for religious reasons, but also to see these centres, their great works of art, and the attractions of their festivals (and indeed the literal meaning of *θεωρία* is the act of seeing). Sanctuaries were sites of musical competitions and pilgrims often travelled accompanied by a chorus.⁸ Alongside the spectators came those intent on providing the spectacles: athletes, poets, and philosophers. And, as we shall see, Attica was to form one of the most significant destinations on this festival circuit.

b. Professionalism and Travel

Travel was undertaken regularly by all Greeks, and was an inherent part of the lives of poets. Moreover, we can set poets in the context

³ Garland (2014) 150–66.

⁴ Ctesicles *FGrHist* 245 F 1; on metic numbers see Duncan Jones (1980); Cohen (2000) 17.

⁵ Cohen (2000) 16–18.

⁶ Hdt. 4.152. A Sostratus of Aegina mentioned in a sixth century dedication at Gavisca in Etruria may be the same man as the one known to Herodotus; see Jeffery (1990) 439.

⁷ See Elsner and Rutherford (2005); Rutherford (2007b) and (2013) esp. 281–303.

⁸ On poetry and pilgrimage see Rutherford (2004), (2005) 142–4, (2013) 237–49; Kowalzig (2005); on *theōria* as presented in drama see Rutherford (1998).

of a broader culture of itinerant professionals who travelled for similar purposes, principally the need or desire for fame and material rewards.

Specialist skill facilitates travel. In a new city, it is a particularly desirable commodity because it is rare. Assuming that the specialist in question does provide a useful service, the wealthy may be prepared to pay a premium for hiring such a worker. The tendency of skilled workers to travel was noted by Homer. In the *Odyssey*, the suitor Antinous rails at Eumaeus for inviting another parasitic beggar (the disguised Odysseus) to the palace. Eumaeus replies that no one ever invites a stranger to come from abroad, except for craftsmen (δημιοεργοί 383):

μάντιν ἢ ἰητῆρα κακῶν ἢ τέκτονα δούρων,
ἢ καὶ θέσπιν ἀοιδόν, ὃ κεν τέρπησιν αἰείδων.
οἷοι γὰρ κλητοί γε βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν.

A prophet or healer of evils or joiner of beams, or even an inspired minstrel, who gives delight with his singing. For these men are summoned across the wide earth.

(*Od.* 17.384–6)

Here we can see that poets are included among a group of skilled workers who may be invited to come from abroad because of the services they provide. All these groups have in common the possession of specialist knowledge, though in widely differing fields. In Eumaeus' list, valuable skills include both mechanical craft (such as that of the carpenter) as well as intellectual arts based on knowledge, such as that of the doctor, prophet and poet.

The skilled craftsmen of classical Athens were a remarkably international group: the artisans working on the Erechtheum, for example, were mostly free non-citizens.⁹ Foreign workers tend to be attracted by vibrant economies that provide opportunities for making contacts

⁹ See Randall (1953) and Epstein (2008). On metic craftsmen in Athens see Whitehead (1977) 116–21 and Cohen (2000) 19–22. Agora inv. IL 1702 is a letter inscribed on a lead tablet was written by a young metic apprentice at a foundry; see Jordan (2000). A series of inscriptions, believed by Meyer to concern resident-alien who avoided prosecution for the non-payment of the tax on resident foreigners (μετοίκιον), list a large number of skilled and unskilled tradesmen and banausic workers, including some musical professionals (e.g. Δημητρία κιθαρῳδός, IG II–III² 1557.63). For the text see Meyer (2010) 83–7 = IG II–III² 1554–9 + *Agora Inv.* I 3183 + SEG XXV.178.

and profits. The great physician Democedes, who found employment with Polycrates of Samos and King Darius of Persia, was richly rewarded for his *technē*.¹⁰ Greek cities were also understood in antiquity to have good reasons for encouraging non-citizen professionals to visit or settle permanently.¹¹ Xenophon declares that a peaceful Athens will be a uniquely attractive destination for many such professionals:

πασῶν δὲ πόλεων Ἀθῆναι μάλιστα πεφύκασιν ἐν εἰρήνῃ αὖξεσθαι. τίνες γάρ, ἡσυχίαν ἀγούσης τῆς πόλεως, οὐ προσδέονται ἂν αὐτῆς ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ ναυκλήρων καὶ ἐμπόρων; οὐχ οἱ πολύσιτοι, οὐχ οἱ πολύουνοι, οὐχ οἱ ἡδύουνοι; τί δὲ οἱ πολυέλαιοι, τί δὲ οἱ πολυπρόβατοι, οἱ δὲ γνώμη καὶ ἀργυρίῳ δυνάμενοι χρηματίζεσθαι; καὶ μὴν χειροτέχναι τε καὶ σοφισταὶ καὶ φιλόσοφοι, οἱ δὲ ποιηταί, οἱ δὲ τὰ τούτων μεταχειριζόμενοι, οἱ δὲ ἀξιοθεάτων ἢ ἀξιακούστων ἱερῶν ἢ ὁσίων ἐπιθυμοῦντες; ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ οἱ δεόμενοι πολλὰ ταχὺ ἀποδίδοσθαι ἢ πρίασθαι ποῦ τούτων μάλλον ἂν τύχοιεν ἢ Ἀθήνησιν;

Of all cities Athens is best suited to prosper in peacetime. For if the city were at peace, who would not have need of her, starting from ship-owners and traders? Would not those who are rich in grain or those who are rich in wine, or those who have fine wine? What of those who are rich in oil, or cattle? Or those with the mind or money for business? And indeed will not those with skill in manual crafts, and sophists and philosophers; poets and those who perform their works; those who seek for spectacles worth seeing or worth hearing, or for the holy and the sacred? And where will those who wish to buy or sell achieve their aims better than in Athens?

(*Vect.* 5.3–4)

Here he outlines the extent of the market for goods and services that Athens could potentially provide.¹² It is this market, and the resulting opportunities for exchange and display, that will attract those with money or talent (including sophists and poets). Athens will prosper, Xenophon assures his readers, because it is able to attract so many rich and talented foreigners. By contrast, smaller and poorer cities, or those without currency, were seen as less able to support, and thus

¹⁰ Hdt. 3.129–31.

¹¹ e.g. Xen. *Vect.* 2.1–2. Xenophon also discusses ways of attracting foreign merchants (3.3), and proposes the building of hotels and other facilities for foreigners (3.12).

¹² For a detailed exposition of this passage and a discussion of the terms employed by Xenophon, see Gauthier (1976) 200–3.

tended to suffer from a lack of, specialist professionals.¹³ Workers will often travel in pursuit of greater opportunities elsewhere. The saying ‘a person’s homeland is anywhere where he can prosper’ had become proverbial by the end of the fifth century.¹⁴

While similarities could be drawn in antiquity between all forms of skilled labour, there were nonetheless observable differences. Farming, for example, might be regarded as a form of *technē*, but one likely to tie the farmer to his land and local market. Artists and artisans were more mobile and often prepared to move to take advantages of new opportunities overseas.¹⁵ That said, artists tended to establish relatively permanent workshops in centres where there was enough work to employ them. Other professionals, however, travelled more frequently as part of their work, while maintaining a base in their home-city.

Two examples of such itinerant professional groups stand out alongside poets: philosophers and athletes. For the former, of particular interest is an international body of professional educators known as sophists. Originally the term sophist (σοφιστής) referred to anyone skilled in a particular branch of expertise, including prophets and poets.¹⁶ By at least the mid fifth century, it could also be used in a derogatory sense to mean a pseudo-intellectual who commonly taught students for money, despite the fact that his teaching was of no value.¹⁷ The extent to which ‘sophists’ constituted an intellectual movement, separate from other strands of philosophy, is uncertain.¹⁸

¹³ Ar. *Plut.* 407–8; Xen. *Cyr.* 8.2.5; Sparta: Plut. *Lyc.* 9.3–4, cf. Arist. *Pol.* 1272b15–20. In the field of poetry, cities could find it difficult to afford the fees of professional performers. The actor Polus was honoured by Samos in 305 for taking a smaller fee than usual (*IG* XII/6 56.9–14 = *SEG* I.362).

¹⁴ πατρις γάρ ἐστι πᾶς ὃν ἂν πράττῃ τις εὖ, Ar. *Plut.* 1151; cf. Eur. fr. 777 TrGF; Ar. fr. dub. 925 K–A; Lys. 31.6.

¹⁵ One example of a travelling sculptor from the fifth century is Pheidias, who worked in Athens, Olympia, and possibly Ephesus (see Cullen (2009) I 621–2). A decline in the number of artists working in Athens during the third century, has been linked to the city’s economic and political decline: see Stewart (1971) 6. A number of these artists are known to have moved to Rhodes: see Goodlett (1991) 675 and 679. On specialization among sculptors see Hochscheid (2015) 157–212.

¹⁶ Hdt. 2.49; Pind. *Isthm.* 5.28.

¹⁷ [Aesch.] *PV* 62, 944; Ar. *Nub.* 331–3, 1111; Xen. *Mem.* 1.6.13; Tell (2011) 11–12.

¹⁸ See Tell (2011) 1–2, who has argued that the term is used by Plato merely as a ‘derogatory label’ for ‘competing articulations’ of philosophy.

Plato provides a detailed picture of the activities of a group of professional intellectuals in the second half of the fifth century. In Plato's *Protagoras*, the house of Callias son of Hipponicus forms the meeting place for many of these foreign teachers. The origins of Callias' guests are diverse: Prodicus is from Ceos, Hippias from Elis, while Protagoras himself, who brings in his train a whole crowd of strangers (ξένοι, 315a7), hails from Abdera. Another major figure at this time, though not included in the *Protagoras*, was Gorgias of Leontini in Sicily, whose displays of rhetorical skill caused a sensation on the occasion of his embassy to Athens in 427.¹⁹ The action of Plato's *Gorgias* takes place on either this or another of his visits to Athens.

Yet although the importance of Athens as a centre for the intellectual world should not be underestimated, it again formed only a part of a broader network. Some orators and philosophers, such as Lysias and Aristotle, settled either permanently or for extended periods in Athens. Many, however, stayed only for a comparatively short while. Protagoras has only recently arrived at the opening of the dialogue (309d3–4, 310b8–d1), arousing much excitement in the young Hippocrates. Indeed the visits of eminent sophists were not as common as one might suppose. Hippias is away from Athens for some time, visiting other cities including Sparta and towns in Sicily.²⁰ The *Meno* is set at a time not long after Gorgias' departure from Athens and alludes to a recent successful tour of Thessaly (70b–c). An important destination for travelling sophists, as for athletes and poets, were panhellenic festivals, particularly the four crown games. Although there was no official contest for oratory or philosophy, displays by wandering sages were common. Empedocles, Gorgias, Hippias, Lysias, and Isocrates all appeared or composed orations to be delivered at Olympia.²¹ If we can believe Dio Chrysostomus' description of the fourth-century Isthmia, these were only the most distinguished out of a crowd of sophists who descended on the games to hawk their talents.²²

¹⁹ Diod. Sic. 12.53; cf. Pl. *Men.* 71c; Thucydides (3.86) mentions the embassy but not Gorgias' involvement.

²⁰ ὥς διὰ χρόνου ἡμῖν κατήρας εἰς τὰς Ἀθήνας. *Hipp. Mai.* 281a1–2.

²¹ Empedocles: Diog. Laert. 8.63; Hippias: *Hipp. Min.* 363c–d; Gorgias: D–K 82 B 7–8a, Philostr. *VS* 1.9.4; Lys. 33; Isocr. 4; see Tell (2007).

²² πολλῶν μὲν σοφιστῶν κακοδαιμόνων βοῶντων καὶ λοιδορουμένων ἀλλήλοις, Dio Chrys. 8.9; cf. Lysias' description of Olympia as a venue for intellectual display (γνώμης δ' ἐπίδειξιν, 33.3).

The criticisms of Plato can sometimes make us forget just how famous, and indeed popular, these travelling professors could become. Well-known sages such as Empedocles and Protagoras could boast of creating a surge of interest among the inhabitants of the cities they visited.²³ All of these men are known for amassing great wealth on these journeys. One possible source of income was in charging for public lectures: Prodicus was said to have offered a menu of classes for either one or fifty drachmas (Pl. *Crat.* 384b). These displays also served in part to attract wealthy students, who would pay special fees for private classes, either for themselves or their sons. Callias, son of Hipponicus, is said to have given considerable sums to sophists. Eupolis mocks Protagoras in his *Flatterers* (fr. 157–8 K–A) for devouring Callias' fortune. Xenophon's Socrates also chides Callias for looking down on 'amateur' philosophers (αὐτουργούς τινὰς τῆς φιλοσοφίας, *Symp.* 3.6.) now that he has paid large sums of money to Protagoras, Gorgias, and Prodicus to learn from their sophistries. He was also known to have hired Euenus of Paros to educate his children for five minae (Pl. *Ap.* 20b). Travel enabled these men to exploit a range of opportunities abroad and thus amass greater wealth than they would have done in one city. Private wealth could even be amassed while the sophist was acting in the public capacity of an ambassador, as was the case with Hippias and Gorgias (*Hipp. Mai.* 282b–e).

Professional wanderers, however, were not only to be found in the field of intellectual endeavour. Long distance travel was also an essential part of an athlete's life with the development of the circuit of panhellenic competitions (περίοδος). The most prestigious contests were the crown games, which were organized so as to avoid clashes between each festival and to permit athletes to move between them all.²⁴ Although such competitions often took place within city festivals, they were open to all Greeks and aimed to attract as broad a group of entrants as possible. Of the total number of victors from the sixth to the first century BC in the crown games, 34 per cent were from the Peloponnese, with the next largest group from central and northern Greece. A further 25 per cent were from the Aegean and Asia Minor and under 12 per cent from the Greek West, meaning that over a third were not from the Greek mainland.²⁵ A similar proportion of

²³ Empedocles: D–K 31 B 112; Protagoras: Pl. *Prot.* 316c5–d1.

²⁴ See Golden (1998) 10–11.

²⁵ Figures are from Golden (1998) 36 and Klee (1918).

the thirty-three athletes honoured by Pindar, over a shorter period in the fifth century, were required to travel great distances to compete. Two of his clients are from the Isthmus and Peloponnese, while another two are Athenian. Six are fellow Boeotians. The largest group is from Aegina (nine victors) but not far behind are the athletes from Italy and Sicily, eight in total. If we exclude the Aeginetans, and include Diagoras of Rhodes, Aristagoras of Tenedos, and Arcesilas and Telesicrates of Cyrene, then twelve of Pindar's victors, or 36 per cent, were not from the Greek mainland.

Like the sophists, athletes of the archaic and classical periods were constantly on the road between different festivals. They boast of the number of victories they have won, and they frequently tell us where. A fifth-century epigram for the athlete Nicolidas of Corinth lists victories at the Pythian, Nemean, and Isthmian games as well as Athens, Pallene, Arcadia, Aegina, Epidaurus, Thebes, Megara, and Phlius.²⁶ At much the same time, Pindar's client Diagoras of Rhodes could be found on the same circuit.²⁷ While Nicolidas and Diagoras covered much of mainland Greece, Theogenes of Thasos may have been even more active, also in the fifth century. His epigram mentions thirteen hundred victories and claims that in twenty-two years he was never defeated in boxing: the equivalent of about a victory a week, if this was the span of his whole career.²⁸ In the course of the fifth and fourth centuries a network of athletic contacts was to develop in order to facilitate this travel and ensure their safety on the road.²⁹ Athletes abroad were under the protection of a truce, announced by ambassadors to all the participating Greek cities, while as wanderers they were able to invoke the protection of their hosts as strangers.³⁰

Both athletes and sophists, therefore, formed part of a panhellenic network that included Athens but stretched across the Greek world. They also appear to have travelled for similar reasons. Athletics, by at least the fifth century, was a highly specialized occupation and success

²⁶ Anon. *Anth. Pal.* 13.19 = 857–68 FGE = Ebert n. 26.

²⁷ Pind. *Ol.* 7.81–7; see Young (1968) 91.

²⁸ Ebert no. 27. On the professionalism of an athlete such as Theogenes see Pleket (1975) 60 = König (2010) 153 and Young (1984) 95.

²⁹ Hornblower and Morgan (2007b) 42.

³⁰ Olympic truce: see Plut. *Lyc.* 1.2; Paus. 5.4.5; Isthmia: Thuc. 8.10.1; Lämmer (1982–3); and Golden (2011) 6–7.

required intensive and regular practice.³¹ Ancient athletes followed strict regimens of training and diet, like their modern counterparts.³² Professional trainers, often former athletes themselves, were frequently hired to improve the athlete's chances of winning.³³ Pindar emphasises that, as for mythical heroes, such toil is worthwhile since demonstrable success at contests abroad will attain for athletes the reward of undying fame.³⁴ And like many of today's sportsmen, athletes earned substantial sums of money in the form of prizes and rewards. Nicolidas claims to have won sixty amphorae of oil at the Panathenaea at Athens. This was a valuable prize: roughly equivalent in cash values to over two years' wages for a common labourer.³⁵ Most of the prizes for the boys' athletic games are conveniently recorded in an inscription dated to around 380.³⁶ The figures seem to corroborate Nicolidas' claim for the men's pentathlon.³⁷ And even if athletes were only offered symbolic prizes at the crown games, their home cities could reward them with gifts of money.³⁸ As well as cash payments, Athens granted athletes the privilege of dining at the state's expense at the prytaneum.³⁹ Competitive sport was thus a

³¹ Athletics as a *τέχνη*: Aesch. fr. 78c.56 TrGF; Pl. *Prot.* 316d; *Alc.* I 108c9–10; *Resp.* 406ab; *Gorg.* 520cd; *Leg.* 840a; Isocr. 15.181–5; Arist. *Pol.* 1279a1–10, 1288b10–22.

³² Pl. *Leg.* 795b: athletes, like soldiers, need training. *Resp.* 403e: approves of an athletes' diet for the guardians; cf. *Leg.* 830a–b and *Resp.* 410b on athletes' diet and training in general, which might even include sexual abstinence. See Pleket (1974) 64 and Young (1984) 143–5.

³³ e.g. Melesias, who was a retired athlete (Pind. *Ol.* 8. 54–66; cf. *Nem.* 4. 93, 6.64–6), or Herodicus of Sylumbria, who is credited by Plato (*Resp.* 406a–b; cf. *Prot.* 316d10–e1) with creating a new *τέχνη* (406b9) out of a combination of *γυμναστική* and medicine; on athletics and education see Pritchard (2003) 302–6 = (2013) 46–53, Miller (2004) 186–95; on trainers in competitive sport c.550–440, see Nicholson (2005) 2–17 and 119–34.

³⁴ e.g. *Ol.* 1: the one who wins at the games by exerting himself to the fullest will have, like Pelops, 'sweet tranquillity' (*μελιτόεσσαν εὐδαν*, 98) and fame (97–8).

³⁵ Young (1984) 115–17 estimated that the minimum daily wage was around 1.4 drachmas and that the lowest price of oil was twelve drachmas an amphora. Therefore, a prize for the men's stadion of one hundred amphoras would represent the equivalent of 847 days' wages. By comparing the minimum Greek wage with that of the USA in 1980 he estimated that the cash value of a hundred amphoras would be the equivalent of \$121,200. Miller (2004) 134 also gives an estimate of around \$150,000.

³⁶ IG II–III² 2311. For the text and suggested restorations see Shear (2003); on the date see p. 96.

³⁷ Shear (2003) 95.

³⁸ Plut. *Sol.* 23.3, Diog. Laert. 1.55. See Young (1984) 128–31.

³⁹ Xenophanes fr. 2.7–9 West, Plat. *Andoc.* 4.31, IG I³ 131.11–18.

serious business from an early period: one that required the athlete to dedicate time to training and travel, while offering the prospect of fame and wealth in return.

The date at which professionalism in athletics first began to emerge has been the subject of intense scholarly debate. Equestrian victors in the archaic and early classical period, such as the elder Cimon or Hieron of Syracuse, were unquestionably wealthy and some competitors in the field and track events may have been as well. This has given rise, in part, to what Young termed the ‘myth’ of amateur athletics: the notion that sport was originally the preserve of the aristocracy and was only later degraded by lower-class athletes competing for money.⁴⁰ Young argued that as early as the archaic period athletes from poor backgrounds could and did earn a living from prizes and state rewards.⁴¹ His views have not been universally accepted, not least because the precise social background of most athletes remains hard to determine. Some have questioned whether the poorest citizens would have been able to afford the cost of training and travel.⁴² Yet even if economic barriers to participation would have excluded some, athletes of the classical period were by no means gentlemen of leisure. Many, especially among the competitors in track and field events, could be described as professionals in the sense that they practised a specialist skill on a regular basis. As we have seen, to be competitive an athlete was required to train; and to compete an athlete had to travel. Success was not achieved with one win but by many, and its rewards were international fame and those tangible symbols of victory: crown, meat, and coin.⁴³

⁴⁰ The principal exponents of this view were Gardiner (1930) 99–116 and H.A. Harris (1964) 187–97. They were inspired by the amateur Olympic movement of de Coubertin in the late nineteenth century. For the argument that the elite attempted to marginalize the work of professional trainers and charioteers in victory commemorations, see Golden (1998) 82–3; (2008) 1–39; and Nicholson (2005). On the supposed dominance of the elite in athletics at Athens and the possible ambivalence of the democracy towards sport, see Golden (1998) 86–7, 141–66; Thomas (2007) 142; Pritchard (2013) 1–2.

⁴¹ Young (1984) 7–12, 109–75.

⁴² For a recent discussion and bibliography see Pritchard (2003) 293–302 = (2013) 39–46 and Stewart (2017).

⁴³ My views on professionalism in ancient athletics are outlined in greater detail in Stewart (2017).

2. NETWORKS OF NON-DRAMATIC POETS c.700–300 BC

We have seen that there existed in archaic and classical Greece what might be termed a culture of travel. It was both a pervasive feature of society in general and particularly evident in the work of certain professions. This was certainly the case for poets, many of whom had been peripatetic during the two centuries prior to the birth of tragedy. Most of the poets for whom we have any biographical information at all are thought to have spent at least some time away from their native cities (see Table 2.1). The exceptions are illuminating: the *Theognidea* seems to concern a particular city, possibly Megara in the verses by Theognis, yet lines 783–8 attest to journeys as far afield as Sicily, Euboea, and Sparta. Alcman and Tyrtaeus are

Table 2.1. Greek poets c.700–350

Poet	Dates active	City of origin	Possible or probable destinations
Homer?	c.700?	Chios?	Delos?
Hesiod	c.700?	Ascra	Chalcis, Delos
Archilochus	c.680–660	Paros	Siris, Sparta?, Thasos
Terpander?	c.680?	Antissa?	Lydia?, Sparta?
Tyrtaeus	c.660–630	Athens?	Sparta
Alcman	c.650	Lydia?	Sparta
Sappho	c.620–590	Mytilene?, Eresus?	Sicily
Alcaeus	c.612–580	Mytilene	Delphi?, Pyrrha (Lesbos)
Arion	c.620	Methymna	Corinth, Italy, Sicily
Theognis	c.640–600?	Megara	Euboea?, Sicily?, Sparta?
Stesichorus	c.600–550?	Himera	Catana, Locri (Italy), Sparta?
Solon	c.594	Athens	Cyprus?, Egypt?, Lydia?
Hipponax	c.540	Ephesus	Clazomenae
Ibycus	c.540	Rhegium	Samos, Sicyon?, Sparta?
Anacreon	c.540–500	Teos	Abdera, Athens, Samos, Thessaly?
Xenophanes	c.540–470	Colophon	Zancle, Catana, Elea, Syracuse?
Simonides	c.540–470	Ceos	Andros, Athens, Rhegium, Sicily, Sparta?, Thessaly
Lasus	c.540–470	Hermione	Athens
Pindar	c.500–440	Thebes	Abdera, Aegina, Argos, Athens, Corinth, Delos, Delphi, Olympia, Nemea, Rhodes, Sicily, Thessaly
Bacchylides	c.500–440	Ceos	Athens, Delos, Delphi, Metapontum, Sicily, Sparta
Phrynis	c.450–410	Mytilene	Athens, Sparta?
Philoxenus	c.430–380	Cythera	Syracuse
Timotheus	c.410–360	Miletus	Athens, Ephesus, Macedonia, Sparta?

not known to have produced poetry in any context other than Sparta, yet the former was believed to have been a Lydian and the latter an Athenian.⁴⁴ If a poet failed to travel, ancient authors assumed that he was a foreigner to begin with.⁴⁵

The same is also true of the few exceptions from the classical period. In the biographical tradition, Sophocles is the outstanding example of a tragic poet who never travelled. The *Vita* ascribes this to particularly strong patriotism: not so much beloved of strangers as a lover of Athens (*φιλαθηναϊότατος*, 10). Yet although Sophocles supposedly never travelled, Hanink notes that the narrative of Sophocles' life in the *Vita* is 'crafted according to the same template that shapes the patronage narratives found in the biographies of his two counterparts [sc. Aeschylus and Euripides].'⁴⁶ As an example of Sophocles' patriotic sentiment, his biographer claims that he turned down numerous invitations to visit the courts of foreign rulers.⁴⁷ Similarly, Ister even argued that Sophocles was not an Athenian but a foreigner from Phlius in the northern Peloponnese.⁴⁸ This story may in part have been invented to support the Dorian claim to the invention of tragedy (on which see Ch. 4.1.a), but it may also have been intended to make the life of Sophocles fit with the standard model of the wandering poet. In the Greek imagination, if not always in reality, a poet was a stranger.

These exceptions are important in proving the general rule of mobility. It is the networks formed by the journeys of poets, together with the strong conviction that poets should travel, that will do much to facilitate the dissemination of tragedy. Here we will briefly review the evidence for networks of travel stretching back to the eighth century and some of the reasons and motives for travel.

⁴⁴ Alcman: see Ch. 2.2.b; Tyrtaeus: Lycurgus *Leocr.* 106; Pl. *Leg.* 629a, cf. scholion *ad loc.*; Paus. 4.15.6; Philochorus *FGrHist* 328 F 215.

⁴⁵ cf. Martin (1992) 428–35, who argues that Hesiod deliberately presents himself as an exile in adopting the persona of the didactic poet.

⁴⁶ Hanink (2010a) 58.

⁴⁷ οὐτω δὲ φιλαθηναϊότατος ἦν ὥστε πολλῶν βασιλέων μεταπεμπομένων αὐτὸν οὐκ ἠθέλησε τὴν πατρίδα καταλιπεῖν, *Vit. Soph.* 10 TrGF.

⁴⁸ *Vit. Soph.* 3 TrGF = *FGrHist* 334 F 34.

a. Aegean and Asia Minor

The earliest, and indeed archetypical, travelling poet known to the Greeks was Homer. It is unlikely that one person called Homer, who was the author of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, ever existed. However, by at least the sixth century travelling poets had 'invented' a legendary predecessor called Homer, on whom they could model themselves.⁴⁹ One group of performers based on Chios, the Homeridae, claimed that its original members had been the descendants of Homer.⁵⁰ The earliest source to suggest that Homer was from Chios is the *Hymn to Apollo*, which dates from around the second half of the sixth century. This poem alludes to the identity of its author as the 'blind man from Chios' and is ascribed to Homer by Thucydides (3.104).⁵¹ Its probable author, Cynaethus, was both a Chian and a Homerid, and as such would have had good motives for promoting the legend of the old master.⁵² An ancestor of this kind was useful, because it invested a performer with authority when performing for audiences abroad. Cynaethus was known in antiquity for passing off his own works as having been composed by Homer. The legend of Homer, therefore, may mirror to some extent the actual activities of historical performers.

Neither Homer nor his putative descendants remained solely on Chios. Other cities in Ionia claimed Homer as their own, including Cyme, Smyrna, and Colophon.⁵³ A later biography ascribed to Herodotus, but in fact dating to the second century AD, ingeniously links Homer to all of these sites through frequent travel. The idea of Homer as a wanderer, however, dates from at least the classical period. Plato, in attempting to argue against the tradition that Homer and Hesiod were capable of teaching moral excellence (*ἀρετή*), states that they never founded schools of followers but wandered like rhapsodes: the term for professional reciters of epic, including the Homeridae.⁵⁴ These poets travelled to festivals in order

⁴⁹ See West (1999); Graziosi (2002), especially 13–50.

⁵⁰ Homeridae: Pind. *Nem.* 2.1–3; Σ *Nem.* 2.1c (Drachmann III pp. 29–30).

⁵¹ τυφλὸς ἀνὴρ, οἰκεῖ δὲ Χίῳ ἐνι παιπαλοέσση, 172; the poem is dated to 523/2 by Burkert (1979) 59–61.

⁵² See West (1975) 165–6 = (2011a) 335–6 and (1999) 368 = (2011a) 414.

⁵³ See Lefkowitz (2012) 16–28.

⁵⁴ "Ὀμηρον δ' ἄρα οἱ ἐπ' ἐκείνου, εἴπερ οἶός τ' ἦν πρὸς ἀρετὴν ὀνῆσαι ἀνθρώπους, ἢ Ἡσίοδον ῥαψωδεῖν ἂν περιμόντας εἶων, καὶ οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἂν αὐτῶν ἀντεῖχοντο ἢ τοῦ χρυσοῦ καὶ ἡνάγκαζον παρὰ σφίσιν οἶκοι εἶναι, ἢ εἰ μὴ ἐπειθον, αὐτοὶ ἂν ἐπαιδαγωγοῦν ὀπῇ ᾗσαν, ἕως ἱκανῶς παιδείας μεταλάβοιεν; Resp. 600d5–e2.

to demonstrate their skills. A fragment attributed to Hesiod (fr. 357 M–W) mentions performances by both of these poets on Delos. This may have inspired the later account of the contest between Homer and Hesiod on the island.

During the archaic and classical period a network of festivals was to develop that included contests for rhapsodes and other kinds of performers. In the Aegean, Delos seems to have had a special prominence, as is reflected in the story of the contest of Homer and Hesiod. Thucydides (3.104.3–6) cites the *Hymn to Apollo* as evidence for Delos' importance from before the reorganization of the festival there in 426/5.⁵⁵ The poem describes a musical and athletic festival at Delos, which attracts a large audience from across Ionia:

ἔνθα τοι ἐλκεχίτωνες Ἰάονες ἡγερέθονται
αὐτοῖς σὺν παίδεσσι καὶ αἰδοίης ἀλόχοισιν.

There indeed the long-robed Ionians assemble together with their children
and their good wives.

(147–8)

The island, barren and mostly uninhabited at the time of Apollo's birth, is itself promised fame and honour (περιτιμήεσσα, 65) as well as sustenance from the crowds of foreigners attracted to the sanctuary (χειρὸς ἅπ' ἀλλοτρίης, 60). The catalogue of regions which mirrors the description of the festival (30–43) is intended to show the importance of his sanctuary across the Aegean.⁵⁶

'Homer' is thus drawn to Delos as it is a large 'international' festival sited at a cult centre of notable pan-Ionian and indeed panhellenic importance. He was by no means an exception: in addition to solo performers, foreign cities appear to have sent choruses to the sanctuary from the archaic period. Eumolpus of Corinth wrote a processional hymn for the Messenians to perform on the island in around the eighth or seventh centuries.⁵⁷ These choruses seem to have competed against each other: Xenophon's Socrates (*Mem.* 3.3.12) notes that the Athenian choruses are second to none. Delos was important because it allowed performers from diverse cities to demonstrate their abilities in front of an international audience.

⁵⁵ Cf. *Od.* 6. 162–9; *Athen.* 234 e–f; *Plut. Thes.* 21; *Paus.* 1.31.2, 8.48.3; see Richardson (2010) 104–5.

⁵⁶ Richardson (2010) 9–13 and 103.

⁵⁷ *Paus.* 4.33.2 = fr. 696 PMG.

In addition to festivals at panhellenic sanctuaries, poets were also attracted to the houses of the powerful and wealthy. The tyrant Polycrates is especially noteworthy for hosting the poets Ibycus of Rhegium and Anacreon of Teos at the end of the sixth century.⁵⁸ According to Strabo (14.1.16 = fr. 483 *PMG*), the name of Polycrates appeared frequently in the works of Anacreon; while a poem ascribed to Ibycus contains a direct address to the tyrant (S151.47–8 *PMGF*). Herodotus (3.121.1) mentions a tradition in which Polycrates was seated with Anacreon at the moment when a herald arrived from Oroites, the man who would later be the cause of the tyrant's death. On Cyprus, Solon wrote flattering elegies addressed to his host, the tyrant Philocyprus, on the occasion of the foundation of his city.⁵⁹

In the archaic period, the barbarian kingdom of Lydia may also have been an attractive destination for poets. This Anatolian kingdom was particularly associated with music. The Lydian and Phrygian modes are thought to have been brought to Greece from the East.⁶⁰ Pindar claimed that Terpander, the legendary singer from Lesbos, had invented the barbitos when listening to music at the banquets of the Lydians.⁶¹ Herodotus (1.55.4) attests to the Lydian passion for music. In addition, much early Greek literature, including the poetry of Alcman, shows the influence of Eastern cultures.⁶² Nicolaus of Damascus, the historian and confidant of Herod the Great in the first century BC, mentioned a Magnes of Smyrna, a travelling epic poet and favourite of Gyges of Lydia.⁶³ West has argued that Nicolaus probably used the fifth-century *Lydiaca* of Xanthus of Sardis as his source.⁶⁴ If so, it is likely that the tradition has some basis in fact. The last king of Lydia, Croesus, was linked in Herodotus to Solon, who is one of the numerous travelling sophists who visited the court at Sardis during its heyday.⁶⁵ Solon is

⁵⁸ Chronology: see Barron (1964) 221–5; Woodbury (1985) 207–14; Hutchinson (2001) 257–8.

⁵⁹ τὸν Σόλων ὁ Ἀθηναῖος ἀπικόμενος ἐς Κύπρον ἐν ἔπειαι αἶνεσε τυράννων μάλιστα, *Hdt.* 5.113.2; Solon fr. 19 West = *Plut. Sol.* 26.2–4.

⁶⁰ Telestes fr. 806 *PMG*.

⁶¹ Fr. 125 S–M.

⁶² See West (1997) 524–6.

⁶³ περιῆει τε τὰς πόλεις ἐπιδεικνύμενος τὴν ποίησιν. τούτου δὲ πολλοὶ μὲν καὶ ἄλλοι ἥρων, Γύγης δὲ μᾶλλον τι ἐφλέγετο, καὶ αὐτὸν εἶχε παιδικά. Nicolaus *FGrHist* 90 F 62.

⁶⁴ West (2011b) 345–6; Hunter and Rutherford (2009b) 2 mention Magnes as an example of a wandering poet but are cautious as to the veracity of Nicolaus' account.

⁶⁵ *Hdt.* 1.29.1; cf. [Pl.] *Ep.* 2.311a–b, in which Croesus and Solon both appear together in a list of wise advisers to tyrants. For a defence of Herodotus' narrative, which does not agree with later chronologies, see Markianos (1974) 13–17.

also said to have gained his wisdom as a lawgiver through his travels in the East, particularly in Egypt.⁶⁶

b. The Greek Mainland

It is in this broader circuit of festivals that Athens would become increasingly important as a centre for poetry. As with Polycrates on Samos, it was the Pisistratid tyrants who initially made the greatest contribution to this development in Attica.⁶⁷ One foreign poet associated with Athens at this time was Lasus of Hermione, who was responsible, according to Herodotus (7.6), for inducing Hipparchus, son of Pisistratus, to drive the oracle-monger Onomocritus out of Athens. Aristophanes (*Vesp.* 1411) presents Lasus as a rival to Simonides, another poet associated with Hipparchus, in the dithyrambic contest. Hipparchus is also supposed to have detailed a warship to transport Anacreon from Samos to Athens after the death of Polycrates ([Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228b–c). Anacreon was said to have celebrated in his poetry another aristocratic Athenian family, that of Critias son of Dropides (Pl. *Charm.* 157e; Σ [Aesch.] *PV* 128 (Dindorf p. 15) = fr. 412 *PMG*). A statue to the poet was erected at some point on the Acropolis—in Pausanias' day it was placed in the vicinity of the images of Xanthippus and Pericles (1.25.1). Hipparchus also appears to have contributed to the festival culture at Athens, in particular by reorganizing the Great Panathenaea, and specifically the contests for rhapsodes.⁶⁸ One non-Athenian competitor at the fifth-century Panathenaea was Ion of Ephesus, who appears as Socrates' interlocutor in Plato's dialogue *Ion*. It is broadly in this context that the earliest Greek tragedies were performed.⁶⁹

The visits of foreign poets to Athens connected Attica with other regions, including the Peloponnese. We are told by Plato that Ion has arrived in Athens via Epidaurus in the Peloponnese where he has been victorious in the Asclepieia: 'a contest of rhapsodes and other music'.⁷⁰ Contests for rhapsodes are attested by Herodotus for the

⁶⁶ Solon fr. 28 West; Hdt. 2.177.2; Pl. *Ti.* 21c–25d; see Markianos (1974) 8.

⁶⁷ See Herington (1985) 88.

⁶⁸ [Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228b, [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 18.1. Several Attic black figure vases from this period may depict rhapsodes in competition: see Shapiro (1993) 95–8.

⁶⁹ See Connor (1990) and West (1989).

⁷⁰ ῥαψωδῶν ἀγῶνα . . . καὶ τῆς ἀλλης γε μουσικῆς, 530a6–7.

sixth century at Sicyon in the northern Peloponnese (Hdt. 5.67). There is also a tantalizing reference to 'tragic choruses' (see Ch. 4.1.a). As at Athens, major reorganization of this festival was undertaken by a tyrant, Cleisthenes. It is quite possible that Sicyon was a destination for travelling poets. Scholars have speculated whether Ibycus might have visited Sicyon before moving to Samos: a suggestion based on allusions to myths concerning Sicyon in his poetry.⁷¹ Further west, Olympia afforded for some poets, as for sophists, an excellent opportunity to display their talents before the crowds gathered to see the athletic contests.⁷² Olympia was in fact the only one of the athletic crown games not to hold a musical contest. By contrast the competition for *citharōdia* at Delphi is said to have dated from 582.⁷³

We are slightly better informed concerning foreign visitors to Sparta, possibly the most important centre in the Peloponnese. Throughout the archaic and classical periods, Sparta could boast of a festival culture to rival Athens. We know for certain of three festivals for Apollo (the Hyacinthia, Gymnopaedia, Carneia), all of which involved musical events. Multiple choral competitions are attested for the Gymnopaedia (boys, men, and possibly old men) and it is likely that the other festivals involved more than one category of performance.⁷⁴ A paean, singing by boys to the cithara and aulos, choruses of young men, and choruses of maidens are all mentioned as events at the Hyacinthia.⁷⁵ The maiden songs of Alcman have been associated with another cult for Orthia-Artemis.⁷⁶ Perhaps one of the earliest testaments to Sparta's reputation for choruses appears in a papyrus fragment ascribed to Ibycus. The poem concerns Castor and Pollux and explicitly mentions Sparta (Λακ] εδαίμονα, S166.30). The following line refers to choruses and possibly equestrian contests (], σ τε χοροῖς ἔππο[, 31).

⁷¹ See esp. the possible allusion to Zeuxippus of Sicyon at S151.41 *PMGF*; see further Barron (1961) 187. On Ibycus' patrons see West (1970) 206–9; Bowie (2009) 122–5; Morgan (2012) 46.

⁷² Diod. Sic. 15.7.3; Pl. *Hp.Mi.* 368b; Dio Chrys. 8.9.

⁷³ Pind. *Pyth.* 12; Paus. 10.9.2; see Larmour (1999) 171–84; Miller (2004) 82–3.

⁷⁴ Boys and men: Athen. 678b–c; cf. three choruses (boys, men and old men) at Spartan festivals: Plut. *Apophth. Lac.* 238a–b; Σ Pl. *Leg.* 633a; see Pettersson (1992) 43.

⁷⁵ Hyacinthia: Thuc. 5.23.5; Paus. 3.19.1–5; Pettersson (1992) 9. Paean: Xen. *Hell.* 4.5.11; Ag. 2.17; boys and young men: Polycrates *FGrHist* 588 F 1 = Athen. 139d; maidens: Eur. *Hel.* 445–52.

⁷⁶ See Clay (1991) 58–9.

Despite the Spartan reputation for xenophobia, these festivals seem to have been well attended by foreign visitors. Xenophon tells us that a certain Lichas became famous for hosting foreign visitors at the time of the Gymnopaedia.⁷⁷ Plutarch, in noting that the news of defeat at Leuctra arrived while the festival was being held and the choruses were performing in the theatre, claims that the city was full of foreigners (ξένων οὔσα μεστή, *Ages.* 29.2). Visitors appear to have partaken of meals and sacrifices at festivals. The fifth-century Attic comedian Cratinus (fr. 175 K–A) mentions a type of Spartan meal held in tents (κοπίς) at which foreigners partook of the feast.⁷⁸ This fragment is part of Athenaeus' discussion of Spartan dining practices (138e) and is followed by a lengthy description of the Hyacinthia festival (139d–f = Polycrates *FGrHist* 588 F 1).

A proportion of these visitors to Sparta had come to perform at the contests or train the choruses. A scholion on the Alcman papyrus notes that the Spartans in the time of its author used foreign poets or chorus trainers.⁷⁹ This is likely to have also been the case in the archaic and classical periods. It has been suggested that Ibycus' Spartan ode was an early epinician offered to a Laconian victor at a contest in Sicyon.⁸⁰ If so, Sparta may have been yet another of the cities visited by this peripatetic poet. A dithyramb by Bacchylides (20 Maehler) was probably composed for a Spartan chorus in the early fifth century. The papyrus preserves the title 'Idas for the Spartans' (Ἰδας Λακεδαιμονίους). Idas is associated with the abduction of Marpessa from a maiden chorus.⁸¹ As Maehler has noted, such a

⁷⁷ *Mem.* 1.2.61; cf. *Plut. Cim.* 10.5.

⁷⁸ Another quotation from a fifth-century comic poet, Epilycus (ἐν Ἀμύκλαισιν παρ' Ἀπελλῶ, fr. 4 K–A), indicates that a feast, which Athenaeus terms a κοπίς, is to take place at the temple of Apollo in Amyclae: the location of the Hyacinthia; cf. ἐπὴν δὲ κοπιζῶσι, πρῶτον μὲν δὴ σκηνὰς ποιοῦνται παρὰ τὸν θεόν, Polemon fr. 86 Preller = *Athen.* 138f. The Carneia also involved feasting in tent-like structures (σκιᾶδες, *Athen.* 141e; Pettersson (1992) 57), in which, according to a Hellenistic epigram, Terpes (or Terpander) was singing when he died by choking on a fig (*Trypho Anth. Pal.* 9.488 = *FGE* 380–3).

⁷⁹ καὶ νῦν ἔτι [ξέ]νικῳ κέχρη[ν]ται διδασκάλῳ χο[ρῶν, Alcman TA 2.36–7 *PMGF*.

⁸⁰ Barron (1984) 20–1.

⁸¹ Marpessa: Ἰδας ὁ Ἀφαρήϊος καὶ ἀρπάσας ἐκ χοροῦ ἔφυγεν, *Plut. Parallel. Min.* 315e; Helen: *Plut. Thes.* 31.1. In another tradition, Idas is associated with the story of the first rape of Helen (usually credited to Theseus). The Helen episode was depicted on the throne at Amyclae (*Paus.* 3.18.15), while her cult was prominent at Sparta and may have been honoured with choruses; see Calame (1977) I 281, 333–50.

theme would be suitable for performance by a chorus of young girls at Sparta, especially given that the foundation myths of many of the Laconian cults, including that of Artemis at Caryae, featured stories of rape.⁸²

As a vibrant centre for poetry, Sparta was inevitably linked to the network of festivals in the Aegean and Asia Minor. Sparta's strongest connection was with the Aegean island of Lesbos. The Lesbian singer Terpander was known as the first victor of the Spartan Carnea, which may have been founded in the first quarter of the seventh century.⁸³ To later authors Terpander was one of the first of a series of foreign poets, who would not only develop Sparta as a centre for choral poetry, but also enhance the stability of its constitution.⁸⁴ According to pseudo-Plutarch (*de Mus.* 1134b–c), a second generation of foreign poets, which included Thaletas of Crete, Xenodamus of Cythera, Xenocritus of Locri, and Sacadas of Argos, were associated with the establishment of the Gymnopaedia.

As with the legend of Homer, we cannot automatically assume that this later tradition reflects the historical reality.⁸⁵ Most scholars agree that the surviving fragments attributed to Terpander are in fact only written under the name of this legendary travelling poet and need not date to the seventh century.⁸⁶ Nevertheless, we can be confident that the legend of Terpander, together with the tradition of foreign poets in Sparta, developed no later than the fifth century. The story of how Thaletas cured the Spartans was known to Pratinas of Phlius, a contemporary of Aeschylus.⁸⁷ In around 450, Hellanicus of Mytilene (*FGrHist* 4 F 85a) listed Terpander first in his catalogue of victors at the Carnea.

As with Homer, travelling singers from Lesbos probably developed and promulgated the myth of a semi-heroic predecessor as part of a

⁸² Maehler (2004) 219; on Caryae see Calame (1977) I 264–76; Fearn (2007) 226–34 prefers one of the Spartan festivals for Apollo.

⁸³ Hellanicus *FGrHist* 4 F 85a = Athen. 635e–f; date: Sosibios *FGrHist* 595 F 3 = Athen. 635e–f.

⁸⁴ Philodemus *de Mus.* fr. 47.30–5, 133.4–7 (Dellatre I p. 75, II p.256); [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1146b; Diod. Sicul. 8.28; Zenob. 5.9; *Suda* μ 701; Photius μ 318.

⁸⁵ See Kivilo (2010) 164–5.

⁸⁶ See Page's comment on *PMG* 697–8 p. 362; West (1992) 330; Beecroft (2008); *contra* Kivilo (2010) 151.

⁸⁷ Pratinas fr. 713iii *PMG* = [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1146b.

strategy to promote their craft in foreign cities.⁸⁸ Sappho attests to the primacy of Lesbian poets in the seventh or early sixth century:

πέπρωχος, ὡς ὅτ' αἰδοῖς ὁ Λέσβιος ἀλλοδαποῖσιν

Pre-eminent, as the singer from Lesbos is among those of other lands . . .
(Fr. 106 Voigt).

Ancient scholars interpreted this line as a reference to Terpander and the right of the descendants of Terpander to compete first at competitions in Sparta.⁸⁹ This custom allegedly gave rise to the saying 'after the Lesbian poet', which is first attested in a play by Cratinus (fr. 263 K–A) and was connected with Terpander by Aristotle in his *Spartan Constitution* (fr. 545 Rose). Aristocleitus or Aristocleides, who was active at around the time of the Persian Wars and was known as the teacher of Phrynis of Mytilene, is said to have claimed descent from Terpander and was identified by some as the Lesbian poet of the saying.⁹⁰ He and others from Lesbos, including Hellanicus, seem to have promoted the myth of Terpander, at least in part, as a way of securing special privileges for Lesbians abroad. The 'family' of Terpander could have functioned as a Lesbian offshoot of the Homeridae on Chios. Terpander was himself believed to have been a descendant of Homer and one of his possible birthplaces, Cyme, was strongly associated with the great master.⁹¹

Lesbos may also have provided a link between Sparta and Asia Minor and, in the archaic period, the important poetic and cultural centre that was Lydia. Herodotus indicates that Croesus had established diplomatic relations with Sparta by the middle of the sixth century, while the poetry of Sappho and Alcaeus attests to contacts between Lydia and Lesbos around half a century earlier.⁹² Some in antiquity, including Aristotle and Crates of Pergamon, believed that Alcman was a stranger-poet from Lydia and not a native Spartan.⁹³ Alcman is said to have been active in the reign of the Lydian king

⁸⁸ Power (2010) 320–3; Beecroft (2008) 225.

⁸⁹ Arist. fr. 545 Rose; Hesych. *μ* 1004; Suda *μ* 701; Eustathius s.v. *Il.* 9.129.

⁹⁰ *Σ Ar. Nub.* 971a (Holwerda I 3.1 p. 187); Suda *φ* 761; Aristocleitus as the singer from Lesbos: Arist. fr. 545 Rose.

⁹¹ Suda *τ* 354; Kivilo (2010) 136–8.

⁹² Sappho fr. 39 and 98 Voigt; Alcaeus is offered money by Lydians (fr. 69 Voigt); Croesus and Sparta: Hdt. 1.69–70.

⁹³ *Ἀριστοτέλης καὶ [σύ]μνηφοι*, fr. 13a 12–13 PMGF; *Ἀλκμάν· Λάκων ἀπὸ Μεσσοῦς· κατὰ δὲ τὸν Κράττηα πταίνοντα Λυδὸς ἐκ Σαρδέων*, Suda *α* 1289. For the full *testimonia* see TA1–9 PMGF; Campbell (1988) 336–45.

Ardys, the successor of Gyges and Croesus' great-grandfather.⁹⁴ This account of Alcman's origins, however, was dismissed by later scholars, including Aristarchus.⁹⁵ Yet while there appears to have been good evidence for Alcman's Spartan origins, the argument for a Lydian connection was not unfounded either, since it was partly based on Alcman's own poetry. The surviving fragments are littered with references to Lydia and, in particular, luxury items such as Lydian headbands, which are also mentioned by Sappho.⁹⁶

Most important is a passage which describes a Lydian.

οὐκ ᾔς ἀνῆρ ἀγρεῖος οὐ-
δὲ σκαῖος οὐδὲ †παρὰ σοφοῖ-
σιν† οὐδὲ Θεσσαλὸς γένος,
Ἐρυσichaίος οὐδὲ ποιμὴν,
ἀλλὰ Σαρδίων ἀπ' ἀκρᾶν

He was no unskilled rustic nor clumsy (not even in the view of unskilled men?) nor Thessalian by race nor an Erysichaeon shepherd: he was from lofty Sardis.⁹⁷

(fr. 16 PMGF)

It is possible that the chorus are describing a Lydian visitor to Sparta. This chorus need not have identified this individual explicitly as Alcman, yet the poet is making a claim, either for himself or somebody else, to a degree of sophistication associated with Lydia and Sardis. Nagy's notion of 'diachronic skewing' may be useful here: the chorus is appealing to the idea of a Lydian sophisticate, which can then be projected onto their own poet, just as the author of the *Hymn to Apollo* appeals to an idea of the blind Homer.⁹⁸

c. The Greek West

Athens and Sparta thus stood at the centre of a wide network. To the east, as we have seen, these contacts spread as far as the coast of Asia

⁹⁴ Suda *a* 1289. See Kivilo (2010) 159–60.

⁹⁵ Suda *a* 1289; Eusebius *Chron.* Ol.30.3 (p. 94 Helm). For the chronology see Markianos (1974) 11; Campbell (1988) 337 n. 4; Hutchinson (2001) 74–5.

⁹⁶ Lydian headbands: *μίτρα* | *Λυδία*, Alcman fr. 1.67–8 PMGF; *μ]ιτράναν δ' ἀρτιως . . . ποικιλαν ἀπὸ Σαρδίω[ν*, Sappho fr. 98.10–11 Voigt. According to Xenophanes (fr. 3 West), the people of Colophon learned luxury from the Lydians.

⁹⁷ The translation is by Campbell (1988) 409; note that the verb could potentially be either second or third person.

⁹⁸ Nagy (2003) 39–40.

Minor and beyond. In the west lay the Greek colonies of Italy and Sicily, a popular destination for wandering poets from an early period. Archilochus compared the Aegean island of Thasos unfavourably with the beauties of Siris in southern Italy (fr. 22 West). Herodotus (1.23–4) tells us that Arion embarked on a tour of Italy and Sicily, after spending some time with the tyrant Periander in Corinth, at around the end of the seventh century. The Parian Marble (*FGrHist* 239 A 36) dates the departure of Sappho for Sicily to around the same time. Half a century later, Xenophanes left his native Colophon to live out a wandering existence as an exile in the West. A surviving fragment attests to a life of travel ‘through the land of Greece’ (ἀν’ Ἑλλάδα γῆν, fr. 8.2 West) over the course of some sixty-seven years. Diogenes Laertius (9.18–20) notes that he visited Zancle and Catana in Sicily and that he wrote verses on the colonization of Elea in Italy. Cynaethus of Chios is said to have performed the poetry of Homer at Syracuse in 504–501.⁹⁹ From the start of the fifth century the growing circle of poetic talent centred on Syracuse included Pindar, Simonides, and Bacchylides. However, most crucially for our purposes, tragic poets also begin to appear in Sicily at this time: Aeschylus and possibly also Phrynichus of Athens. They were attracted to Sicily by the wealth and generosity of the Sicilian tyrants: notably Hieron of Syracuse and Theron of Acragas. The activities of these poets in Sicily are discussed in Chapter 4.

This traffic was not all one way, however. Performers from the Greek West were active on mainland Greece. In addition to Ibycus, we hear of Xenocritus of Locri, who is associated with Sparta, and Eunomus of Locri and Ariston of Rhegium, who competed at Delphi.¹⁰⁰ There are indications that Stesichorus’ circuit was also very wide indeed. He was influenced by the broad Doric *koinē* shared by many of the cities of the Greek West.¹⁰¹ Later traditions suggest that he may have travelled widely in Italy and Sicily.¹⁰² Though one area

⁹⁹ Σ Pind. *Nem.* 2.1c = Hippostratus *FGrHist* 568 F 5.

¹⁰⁰ Xenocritus: [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1134c; Σ Pind. *Ol.* 10.18b (Drachmann I p. 315); Eunomus and Ariston: Strabo 6.1.9. See Morgan (2012) 38–40; Finglass (2014a) 22–3.

¹⁰¹ Hutchinson (2001) 114–15; Willi (2008) 82–5.

¹⁰² His place of birth is variously recorded as Himera in Sicily, Mataurus in Italy and Pallantium in Arcadia, from which he is said to have fled into exile: see *Suda* σ 1095; Steph. Byz. μ 97 (p. 276 Billerbeck); Kivilo (2010) 68; cf. Terpander’s exile in Sparta: *Suda* μ 701. His tomb was located at Catana in Sicily: *Suda* π 225; Phot. π 378; *Anth. Pal.* 7.75; see Kivilo (2010) 79. Stesichorus is also closely associated with Epizephyrian Locri: for advice given to the Locrians see Arist. *Rhet.* 1394b–1395a. Helen supposedly sent Leonymus of Croton, wounded in a battle between Croton and

of operations was the Greek West, he is likely to have also travelled to Greece itself. The Parian Marble gives the date of Stesichorus' arrival in Greece.¹⁰³ Unfortunately it is a century too late, erroneously coinciding with Aeschylus' first victory and Euripides' birth in either 486/5 or 485/4. Was this a different Stesichorus or did the compiler of the chronology simply make a mistake? The latter is more likely, as no other Stesichorus from this period was famous enough to merit inclusion on the tablet. The little we know of his poetry indicates that he was well aware of myths concerning central and mainland Greece and it is probable that he aimed to address a panhellenic audience, rather than the Greek West alone.¹⁰⁴ The setting of his *Oresteia* in Sparta, for instance, has long been taken as evidence that Stesichorus did indeed reach the banks of the Eurotas.¹⁰⁵ Though the location of the narrative is not sufficient proof on its own, nevertheless a journey to Laconia is certainly plausible given the international importance of Sparta as a centre for poetry in the archaic period.

3. REASONS AND MOTIVATIONS FOR THE TRAVEL OF POETS

This account of the festival circuit prior to and during the development of tragedy is by no means exhaustive. Yet even the few sketchy details we have suggest that frequent movement was taking place, over a wide area, for around a hundred years prior to the development

Locri, to tell Stesichorus to write his palinode; see Pl. *Phaedr.* 243a; Paus. 3.19.11–13; Conon *FGrHist* 26 F 1.18.

¹⁰³ *Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 50; see Bowie (2015) on possible performances at Athens.

¹⁰⁴ Finglass (2012b), on fr. 183 Finglass, has shown that Stesichorus had an intimate knowledge of both the geography of mainland Greece and the mythical traditions concerning specific ethnic groups, such as the Dryopes and Achaeans.

¹⁰⁵ See Bowra (1934); Kivilo (2010) 68. Finglass (2014a) 27–9 argues that a Spartan setting would not require a Spartan audience: Stesichorus' poetry was distinctly panhellenic and thus suitable for performance in multiple locations, in contrast to Ibycus who may have specific audiences in mind. Recent studies have noted the possibility that Stesichorus could have been playing to the pro-Spartan sentiments of Dorian Taras as well: see Burnett (1988) 145–7; Willi (2008) 83–4 and Morgan (2012) 43–5. Finglass (2012b) 43–4 has suggested that on at least one occasion Stesichorus may have avoided mentioning a myth that reflected well on Sparta, which may suggest that he had other patrons in mainland Greece.

of tragedy. Poets are likely to have travelled for a variety of reasons, which will have differed from case to case. Nevertheless, as with other Greeks and, as we have seen, other Greek professions, some common factors can be identified.

a. Exiles and Economic Migrants

A considerable proportion of poets are thought to have left their homes as political exiles. This seems to have been the case for Alcaeus and possibly also Hipponax.¹⁰⁶ Alcaeus expressed a longing for the political life of Mytilene, from which he had been cut off by exile.¹⁰⁷ The Persian conquest of the Greek cities of Asia Minor in the mid-sixth century was thought to have led Anacreon to embark on his life of travel.¹⁰⁸ His existence as a wanderer most probably made it easier for him to establish a panhellenic reputation. As Critias, the late fifth century poet, philosopher, and statesman, put it, 'Teos brought sweet Anacreon to Greece' (*ἡδὺν Ἀνακρείοντα Τέως εἰς Ἑλλάδα ἀνῆγεν*, 88 B 1.2 D–K). The same may also have been true for Xenophanes. As we have seen, the Greeks tended to imagine their poets as foreigners and outsiders, regardless of the actual circumstances of these individuals. Yet the overall prominence of exile in the traditional idea of the poet may itself testify to actual instability and mobility. The work of the poet may have seemed both suitable and attractive to dispossessed exiles.

A lack of economic opportunities at home may have compelled others to emigrate. According to Critias, Archilochus' stated reason, in his own poetry, for leaving Paros for Thasos was poverty.¹⁰⁹ Hesiod tells us that his father left Cyme under similar circumstances (*Op.* 635–40). Hipponax seems to have cultivated the image of the poor poet, complaining that 'wealth is blind'.¹¹⁰ The *Theognidea* frequently bemoans the evils of both poverty and exile, although it is uncertain whether all or any of these lines were the work of Theognis.¹¹¹ This image closely corresponds to Solon's description (fr. 13.41–3) of the man who, upon

¹⁰⁶ Alcaeus: see Bowie (2007) 33–9; Hipponax: Suda ι 588.

¹⁰⁷ *ἡμέρων ἀγόρας ἄκουσαι*, fr. 130b.3 Voigt.

¹⁰⁸ Anacreon's departure from Teos to Abdera: Suda α 1916; Strabo 14.1.30.

¹⁰⁹ *καταλιπὼν Πάρον διὰ πέναν καὶ ἀπορίαν ἦλθεν εἰς Θάσον*, fr. 295 West = Critias 88 B 44 D–K = Ael. VH 10.13; cf. fr. 21 and 116 West.

¹¹⁰ *Πλοῦτος-ἔστι γὰρ λίην τυφλός*, fr. 36.1 West; cf. fr. 38 and 39.

¹¹¹ *Theognidea*: ἀ δειλή Πενίη, 649; cf. 267, 351, 620, 1129–30; exile: 341–50, 667–82, 1197–1202. On these lines as evidence for the possible exile of Theognis see West (1974) 69; Bowie (2007) 42–6.

finding himself without means, turns to the gifts of the Muses, among other occupations, in order to improve his situation. Although we cannot be sure how much of this reflects the historical reality, the idea of the poet as a destitute wanderer certainly appears to have been one possible element of the poetic persona from an early period.

b. The Pursuit of Fame

Yet not all travel was involuntary and for poets there were clear advantages to a life spent on the road. Frequent travel enabled a poet to publicise his works. At an event like the festival on Delos in the *Hymn to Apollo*, a wide variety of people could hear a poet's works and report on it, either to future visitors or (if the audience itself contained visitors from other regions) to their compatriots at home. This is what 'Homer' explicitly tells the Delian girls to do in the *Hymn to Apollo*:

χαίρετε δ' ὑμεῖς πᾶσαι· ἐμείο δὲ καὶ μετόπισθε
μνήσασθ', ὅππότε κέν τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων
ἐνθάδ' ἀνείρηται ξείνος ταλαπείριος ἑλθών·
ὦ κοῦραι, τίς δ' ὕμνιν ἀνὴρ ἥδιστος ἀοιδῶν
ἐνθάδε πωλεῖται, καὶ τέψ' ἔρπεσθε μάλιστα;

Farewell to you all; and remember me in times to come, whenever one of the earth-dwelling men, a long-suffering stranger, comes here and asks you 'O maidens, which of the singers that comes here is your favourite and who pleases you most?'.
(166–70)

The object of performing is to gain a reputation as the sweetest of the poets (ἥδιστος ἀοιδῶν). The poet builds his reputation by travelling to Delos: other strangers who come there will hear of his fame and in turn contribute to its growth. In return, the poet promises to celebrate Delos and its maiden choruses, both in thanks and because, quite reasonably, the more famous the sanctuary, the more visitors it will attract, and therefore the more famous the poet will become. And Homer (or Cynaethus) is in an especially good position to spread their fame precisely because he is a wanderer:

ἡμεῖς δ' ὑμέτερον κλέος οὔσομεν ὅσον ἐπ' αἶαν
ἀνθρώπων στρεφόμεσθα πόλεις εὖ ναιεταώσας·

And I will carry your fame as far as I wander over the earth through the well-situated cities of men.
(174–5)

In both cases, if the poet and the sanctuary are to become famous, constant movement is essential.

Wandering poets promise their patrons fame on the basis that their poetry will be continuously re-performed across the Greek world. Ibycus declares that Polycrates, like the heroes of the Trojan War, will have fame for his beauty, comparable to the fame Ibycus will receive for his song:

τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰὲν
καὶ σὺ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔξείς,
ὥς κατ' αἰοῖδ' αἰὲν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος.

For among them there is the fame of beauty always; and you, Polycrates, will have undying fame, as my fame comes from my song.¹¹²

(S151.46–8 *PMGF*)

Pindar promises his athletes fame, because he will spread it across Greece on his travels. He adopts the chariot of the athlete as the means by which he travels.¹¹³ This is easily transformed into the chariot of the Muses, by which successful poets are raised to the height of glory.¹¹⁴ The fame of the poet is as pressing a concern as that of his patron.

Not only does a poet travel, but so does his poetry, and it carries his name and that of his patron. Pindar compares his poetry to victory statues: both have the same end in bringing the victor fame. The poem is more successful because, by means of sea travel, it can move and, we may assume, be re-performed in a variety of locations.¹¹⁵ His poetry is like the exotic wares shipped across the sea by Phoenician traders:

τόδε μὲν κατὰ Φοίνισσαν ἐμπολὴν
μέλος ὑπὲρ πολιᾶς ἁλὸς πέμπεται.

This song is being sent in the manner of Phoenician wares across the grey sea.

(Pind. *Pyth.* 2.67–8)

¹¹² On the translation and text see Hutchinson (2001) 253–4.

¹¹³ Pind. *Ol.* 1.110, 6.22–8, *Nem.* 1.4–6.

¹¹⁴ 'Simonides' *Anth. Pal.* 6.213 = *FGE* 792–5; Simon. fr. 519.79 *PMG*; Pind. *Isthm.* 2.1–2.

¹¹⁵ On moving poems: Pind. *Nem.* 5. 1–5; *Isthm.* 2. 45–6. Monuments and poems: cf. Simon. fr. 581 *PMG*; see Smith (2007). On the relationship between poetry and sculpture see Steiner (1998), O'Sullivan (2003) and Hubbard (2004) 75–9.

It is along these same lines that Theognis predicts a poetic afterlife for his beloved Cynrus:

σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ πτέρ' ἔδωκα, σὺν οἷς' ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πόντον
 πωτήσῃ καὶ γῆν πᾶσαν ἀειρόμενος
 ῥηϊδίως. θοίνῃς δὲ καὶ εἰλαπίνῃσι παρέσσηι
 ἐν πάσαις, πολλῶν κείμενος ἐν στόμασιν,

I have given you wings, with which you will fly, rising with ease, across the boundless sea and all the earth. And you will be at every banquet and feast, lying on the tongues of many.

(*Theogn.* 237–40 West)

Rather than prosaically travelling by ship, Cynrus is given wings by Theognis' poetry as that poetry moves abroad. Theognis envisions frequent reperformances in the context of the symposium.¹¹⁶ This, alongside more formal musical festivals, was a common venue for poetry recitals, which could include excerpts of tragedy. In Aristophanes' *Clouds* (1353–72), an ode by Simonides and speeches by Aeschylus and Euripides are proposed for recitation at a celebratory banquet. In the case of epinician, odes were probably performed at a celebration for the victor and subsequently re-performed either in the manner suggested by Aristophanes, or more formally, possibly with a full chorus in the context of a larger festival.¹¹⁷ For each poet, one performance in one place is never enough: the poems must travel through the whole expanse of Greece and for all time.

For such reperformance to be possible, we must assume that the dissemination of texts occurred at an early stage. Indeed Hubbard has argued that the diffusion of texts of epinician odes began with their first performances.¹¹⁸ These books might have been exchanged among the elite with the aim of advertising their achievements to as wide an audience as possible: the stated purpose of epinician lyric

¹¹⁶ See Herington (1985) 38, 48–56; Hubbard (2004) 82–4.

¹¹⁷ See Clay (1999); Currie (2004) 51–62 and (2011); Hubbard (2004) and (2011) 347–8; Swift (2010) 105. Choral performance has been disputed, e.g. by Heath (1988) and Heath and Lefkowitz (1991).

¹¹⁸ Hubbard (2004) and (2011).

itself. The author may have sent the text of the poem to his clients. Bacchylides despatches a winged poem to the king of Macedon:

ὄρμαίνω τι πέμπειν
χρύσειον Μουσᾶν Ἀλεξάνδρῳι πτερόν

I desire to send a golden wing of the Muses to Alexander

(Bacchyl. 20B 3–4 Maehler).

Poets and patrons intended for these works to circulate quickly. A poem's success is measured by the ground it covers.

c. The Pursuit of Wealth

Travel also offered the prospect of acquiring riches in the form of prizes and fees at festivals, as well as patronage in the houses of the wealthy.¹¹⁹ An early example of a poet who seems to have travelled with this purpose in mind is Arion. According to Herodotus, he earned great wealth (χρήματα μεγάλα, 1.24) after a visit to Italy and Sicily in the time of Periander (c.627–587). Herodotus describes him as the finest citharode (κιθαρωδός) and singer (ἀοιδός) of his day. He also mentions that he took a costume (σκευή, 1.24.4–6) on his fateful return voyage, which suggests that his usual performances were not spontaneous but rather designed for a public audience (the probable source of his income).¹²⁰

Festivals were an enticing source of wealth. In the fifth century, the rhapsode Ion alludes to the money that might come to him from a successful performance at the Panathenaea (αὐτὸς γέλασσομαι ἀργύριον λαμβάνων, Pl. *Ion* 535e4). Two fourth century accounts of prizes at musical competitions survive from Athens and Eretria.¹²¹ Successful citharodes, the highest earning musical professionals, would be rewarded with 200 drachmas at the Eretrian Artemisia and a crown worth 1,000 drachmas at the Panathenaea. Prizes for runners-up, the payment of living costs, and a share of the meat at sacrifices made it worthwhile for poets to spend money on travelling to competitions,

¹¹⁹ See Gzella (1971).

¹²⁰ Costumes at festival performances: Pl. *Ion* 535d2–3; cf. Power (2010) 17: 'skeuē and monetary earnings are cognate, mutually reinforcing'. Wilson (2004) 285 claims that this passage is informed by the later professionalism of the fifth century; yet we should be wary of dismissing such an early source too easily.

¹²¹ Athens: IG II–III² 2311.1–22; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 60.3; Shear (2003) 88–9; Eretria: IG XII/9.189.

even if they were ultimately unsuccessful.¹²² Though we have very little information concerning the organization of early festivals, there is little to suggest that it was substantially different from later periods. Panathenaic amphorae, which contained the oil granted to successful athletes, appear first around 560, and it is reasonable to assume that prizes for musical victors also date from this period.¹²³ Symbolic prizes, which could be later dedicated as a memorial, were certainly awarded at other contests. Hesiod claims to have won a tripod at funeral games at Chalcis (*Op.* 656–7). Echembrotus of Arcadia, who is recorded as the first victor of the aulodic contest at Delphi in 586, also received a tripod (Paus. 10.7.4, 7.6).

Poets frequently allude to gifts of hospitality from the wealthy patrons they visit. Demodocus is given meat by Odysseus, both because poets in general are worthy of honour, and in response to his song (*Od.* 8.475–81). Eumaeus' designation of poets as those who are called from abroad (*Od.* 17.386), suggests that potential patrons actively sought the best poets, and poets the best opportunities. In the *Iliad*, the singer Thamyris has his unfortunate encounter with the Muses on the plain of Dorion, as he was travelling from Eurytus of Oechalia (*Οἰχαλίηθεν ἰόντα παρ' Εὐρύτου Οἰχαλιῆος*, 2.596). The purpose of this journey is not mentioned, yet it is possible that Eurytus was known as a former patron, much as Alcinous was to Demodocus.¹²⁴ The feeding of poets as a reward for their song presages the meal prepared for Pindar at the house of his patron Chromius in Sicily:

ἔσταν δ' ἐπ' ἀυλείαις θύραις
 ἀνδρὸς φιλοξείνου καλὰ μελπόμενος,
 ἔνθα μοι ἄρμόδιον
 δέπνον κεκόσμηται, θαμὰ δ' ἄλλοδαπῶν
 οὐκ ἀπείρατοι δόμοι
 ἐντί·

I stand singing of fair deeds at the outer doors of a man who is a friend to strangers, where there is a fitting meal prepared for me, for the house is not unaccustomed to the frequent visits of men from other lands.

(Pindar *Nem.* 1.19–24)

¹²² Prizes and fees: *IG* XII/9.189.15–24; sacrifices: *IG* IV² 1.40/41.

¹²³ See Boardman (1991) 167–8.

¹²⁴ Gentili (1988) 285 treats Thamyris as an exception, but, as Wilson (2009b) 46 notes, *Od.* 17.386 would seem to suggest otherwise. Wilson's claim that Thamyris was necessarily a 'marginal figure' is equally uncertain.

Pindar presents himself as a traveller in search of a patron who will feed him and expects hospitality as a stranger. In ancient sources, travelling sages frequently gather at the doors of great men, hoping for a meal.¹²⁵ Pindar was also known, from his poetry, to have charged high fees.¹²⁶ This reputation may have given rise to a number of anecdotes concerning the poet's life. In one example, Pindar is said to have asked for the massive fee of 3,000 drachmas.¹²⁷

While there is ample evidence that poets did receive material rewards from their hosts, there is much disagreement about when poets first started to purposely seek out fees abroad as professionals. Many scholars have seen the archaic period as a time of change, with the introduction of coinage in particular leading to the gradual commodification of poetry.¹²⁸ The development of professionalism is most frequently connected with the final decades of the sixth and the first of the fifth century, roughly corresponding to the career of Simonides, who was believed by ancient scholars to be the first poet to charge a fee for poetry.¹²⁹ Bowie, however, has questioned whether any significant change took place in the relationship between poet and patron between 550 and 450, suggesting that even as late as the 470s, near the end of Simonides' lifetime, the poet's relationship with his audience was characterized primarily by guest-friendship (*ξενία*), rather than patronage.¹³⁰ Others have associated the emergence of professionalism with the New Music from the mid-fifth century.¹³¹

¹²⁵ e.g. Pl. *Resp.* 489b–c; Arist. *Rhet.* 1391a10–12; Diog. Laert. 2.69. Hipponax's request for clothing (*δὸς χλαῖναν Ἰππώνακτι*, fr. 32.4 West, cf. fr. 34; Ar. *Av.* 936–46) from his divine patron Hermes was said by Plutarch (*de comm. not.* 1068b) to have been regularly quoted by the wise (*σοφοί*) who lacked food and shelter.

¹²⁶ *Pyth.* 11.42, see Finglass (2007b) 112–13; cf. *Nem.* 1.19–24, 10.43; *Isthm.* 2.6–11.

¹²⁷ *Σ Nem.* 5.1a (Drachmann III p. 89).

¹²⁸ See e.g. Von Reden (1995) 30.

¹²⁹ See Gzella (1971); Cairns (2011) 21–36. Simonides: *ὁ Σιμωνίδης δοκεῖ πρῶτος σμικρολογίαν εἰσενεγκεῖν εἰς τὰ ἄσματα καὶ γράφει ἄσμα μισθοῦ*, *Σ Pax* 697b (Holwerda II.2 p.107); *πρώτου Σιμωνίδου προκαταρξαμένου*, *Σ Isthm.* 2.9a (Drachmann III p.214); *Suda* σ 440; Detienne (1967) 106; Woodbury (1968) 527–42, at 535; Svenbro (1976) 175–6; Bell (1978) 29; Gentili (1988) 162; Hornblower (2009) 42.

¹³⁰ Bowie (2009) 134–5, and (2012) 83.

¹³¹ See Csapo (2004b) 246; cf. Roselli (2005) 37; Power (2010) 111, commenting on Pl. *Leg.* 700a–701b, argues that Plato is influenced by the 'resentment of fourth century elites towards their own musical culture'. D'Angour (2006), however, while not disputing that professionalism was a late development, argues that the changes brought about by the New Music were less revolutionary and more the product of a gradual development dating back to the sixth century.

However, it is difficult to completely discount the importance of material rewards for poets before this date. Anacreon, whose career overlapped with that of Simonides, and Ibycus, who belonged to the previous generation, may be cited as examples of early professional court poets.¹³² It is generally accepted that the *Odyssey* contains depictions of poets who were directly supported by wealthy patrons in return for their services.¹³³ While we need to be cautious in ascribing motives to individuals, hospitality and prizes may at least have sustained the travel of poets from an early period. The prospect of such rewards could also have provided an additional incentive for travel by the end of the sixth century at the latest.¹³⁴

CONCLUSION

Our purpose in this chapter has been to give an impression of the ‘infrastructure’ that permitted the swift dissemination of tragedy in the fifth and fourth centuries. The first tragic poets moved in a world that was already highly interconnected and would remain so throughout the classical period. Individual cities and sanctuaries form stopping places on a well-established circuit, while the visits of poets, pilgrims and spectators served to maintain contacts between these centres. While some poets travelled as a result of political and economic instability, others may have deliberately left their homes. They modelled themselves on the heroes of their works, whom they saw as travellers on a ‘circuit’, motivated to embark on journeys by the promise of fame and material rewards. Festivals provided the ideal platform for poets to display their skills to large audiences and obtain valuable prizes and commissions. Cities were keen not only to welcome foreign talent but even to attract it actively from abroad due

¹³² e.g. Kantzios (2005) 228: the poetry of Anacreon represents a ‘deviation from the old aristocratic model of sympotic expression’, due to his status as an itinerant professional; cf. Nicholson (2000) 237.

¹³³ Bowie (2012) 84; Stephanie West (in Heubeck et al. (1988) 96) acknowledges that performers in the *Odyssey* are professionals, yet questions whether this reflected historical reality.

¹³⁴ See further my discussion in Stewart (2016b).

to a universal demand for skilled and specialist labour. In this broader context, poets formed but one element in a class of mobile professionals, who often moved between the same festivals and competed with one another for the attention of audiences and patrons. Together they would create a culture that was truly panhellenic, from which tragedy would ultimately evolve.

Tragedy in Attica c.500–300 BC

INTRODUCTION

The dramatic festivals of Attica have at times been characterized as peculiarly Athenian events, with tragedy featuring as a political genre presented to the Athenian people by Athenian citizens.¹ And yet the city of Athens played a major role in the process of tragedy's dissemination. By the start of the fifth century, Athens was a significant part of a circuit of festivals stretching across the Greek world. The contention of this chapter is that Athens and the City Dionysia formed a Panhellenic centre within this broader network.

In what way can the Athenian festivals be regarded as Panhellenic? The theatre undoubtedly formed one of many gathering places for the Athenians and at times the audience of comedy could be treated as representative of the citizen body (Ar. *Nub.* 575–7). In 425 Aristophanes (*Ach.* 504–5) assumed that only Athenians were present at the Lenaea, a winter festival of less prestige than the Great Dionysia.

¹ The notion of theatre as a creation of the city was well articulated by Vernant (1986) 22: 'on peut dire que la tragédie, c'est la cité qui se fait théâtre, qui se met en scène elle-même devant l'ensemble des citoyens.' The idea was also presented forcefully by many of the contributors to the *Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy*, e.g. Cartledge (1997) 18 claims that 'all Athenian tragedy was political, in that it was staged by and for the *polis* of the Athenians'. Actors, he continues, 'had to be citizens, since they were considered to be performing a properly civic function'. Goldhill (1997) 58, in his study of the audience of tragedy in the same volume, similarly comments: 'it is certain that a very large majority of this huge audience was made up of Athenian citizens—adult enfranchised males.' E. Hall (1997) 95 adds: 'the plays were performed at festivals defined by their nature as celebrations of Athenian citizenship. The texts were mediated through performance by agents likewise sharing Athenian citizenship: the chorus-members, actors and sponsors.' For a response see Kaimio (1999), who argued that the dominance of citizen performers had been exaggerated.

Like all Greek festivals, those at Athens were managed, and to some extent paid for, by the host city. As Goldhill and others have noted, many of the rituals of the Dionysia—including processions, the presentation of crowns to distinguished citizens and foreign benefactors, the libations offered by the generals, the delivery of tribute by the allies, and the parade of war-orphans—served to glorify the democratic imperial city.² In these ‘pre-play ceremonies’, the Athenian *polis* is manifest as the impresario and patron of the contests. The Dionysia was certainly an Athenian event in the sense that it redounded to the glory of the Athenian *polis*. The point at issue here is whether these events created connections between Athens and other Greek cities.

I suggest that there are two principal ways in which a festival might be regarded as Panhellenic. First, it serves as a gathering place for Greeks from more than one state or region. The Athenians intended for their city to be open to the Greek world and they took active steps to ensure the presence of allied delegations at the Dionysia. The audience of most performances of tragedy in the classical period would have contained a significant proportion of non-Athenian visitors and resident aliens. Second, a Panhellenic festival provides opportunities for display that are open to all Greeks. Not only was the city itself on view to its visitors, but many of those who had travelled to Athens had come with the intention of demonstrating their excellence in a number of areas. These included music, poetry, and specifically drama.

To understand the dissemination of tragedy, we need to take into account Athens’ status as a Panhellenic centre. It is not just that Athenians ‘exported’ tragedy abroad; they also arranged for tragedy to be displayed within their own city to an audience of Greeks.

1. THE AUDIENCE

Throughout the classical period Athens could boast of a large and well-funded programme of festivals to which foreign visitors would

² On the events of the Dionysia in general see *DFA*² 57–125 and C–S 112–21; for their political significance see Goldhill (1987). For the procession see *IG* II–III² 1006.11–13, 1008.14–16, 1028.17–19. On crowns and honours see Wilson and Hartwig (2009) 22–3, who provide a full list of testimonia. For the orphans’ parade see Isoc. 8.82, Aeschin. 3.153–4; Goldhill (1987) 68 = Goldhill in Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) 113.

flock each year.³ Indeed, Athens could claim to be continually open to foreigners, with as busy a festival programme as any other city.⁴ The potential of these festivals to attract foreign spectators (and, as we shall see, performers) was a source of pride. Isocrates believed that Panhellenic gatherings benefited Greece as a whole, in part because they offered visitors the opportunity both to display their abilities and to view those of others:

καὶ μήτε τοῖς ἰδιώταις μήτε τοῖς διενεγκοῦσιν τὴν φύσιν ἀργὸν εἶναι τὴν διατριβήν, ἀλλ' ἄθροισθέντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐγγενέσθαι τοῖς μὲν ἐπιδείξασθαι τὰς αὐτῶν εὐτυχίας, τοῖς δὲ θεάσασθαι τούτους πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγωνιζομένους.

The time spent [on festivals] is no idle pastime either for the lay spectator or for those who naturally excel, but rather when the Greeks are gathered together it is possible for the one party to display their own good fortune and for the other to watch them in competition with their opponents.

(4.44)

Isocrates has the athletic contests of Olympia especially in mind here, at which this speech was ostensibly delivered. Yet his overall argument is that Athens has provided Panhellenic festivals on an equal scale and of equal importance:

τοσοῦτων τοίνυν ἀγαθῶν διὰ τὰς συνόδους ἡμῖν γιγνομένων, οὐδ' ἐν τούτοις ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν ἀπελείφθη. Καὶ γὰρ θεάματα πλεῖστα καὶ κάλλιστα κέκτηται, τὰ μὲν ταῖς δαπάναις ὑπερβάλλοντα, τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὰς τέχνας εὐδοκιμοῦντα, τὰ δ' ἀμφοτέροις τούτοις διαφέροντα· καὶ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν εἰσαφικνουμένων ὥς ἡμᾶς τοσοῦτόν ἐστιν ὥστ' εἴ τι ἐν τῷ πλησιάζειν ἀλλήλοις ἀγαθόν ἐστιν, καὶ τοῦθ' ὑπ' αὐτῆς περιειλήφθαι.

And since so many benefits accrue to us through such gatherings, our city has not been behind in supplying them. For very many and very fine spectacles have been established, some outstanding in the sums spent on them, others in the skills on display, and others for both of these qualities; and the number of those who visit us is such that, if there is any benefit in bringing others together, it is achieved by our city.

(4.44–5)

³ See Roselli (2011) 118–57. For the political and financial importance of bringing so many foreigners to Athens see Ar. *Vesp.* 656–60; Xen. *Vect.* 3.4; and [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 1.16–17.

⁴ ἢ δ' ἡμετέρα πόλις ἅπαντα τὸν αἰῶνα τοῖς ἀφικνουμένοις πανήγυρίς ἐστιν. Isoc. 4.46; cf. Thuc. 2.38.1.

Isocrates here articulates a vision of Athens as a leader of Greeks in a field in which all Greek cities compete. Her great pride is that her festivals are visited and admired by outsiders.

The presence of a Panhellenic audience at Athens is frequently alluded to in ancient sources. Theophrastus' 'shameless man' (*Char.* 9.5) makes his foreign guests (ξένοι) pay for seats at the theatre for him and his family.⁵ The poet Agathon is supposed to have appeared in front of 'thirty thousand Greeks' in 416.⁶ Some spectators may have been tourists, travelling merely to see the sights of Athens. Plato (*Resp.* 475d) refers to fans of choruses who move from city to city to see performances. Others may have attended in a more official and public capacity. The allies sent delegations to accompany their offerings of tribute and to take part in the festival procession.⁷ Aristophanes, looking forward to the next Dionysia, refers to allied delegations in the parabasis of the *Acharnians* (643–4). Visitors from beyond the sphere of Athenian political influence were also possible: Isocrates refers to the presence of both allies and other Greeks (8.82). In some cases these arrivals would have been ambassadors, such as the Macedonians granted front row seats in the theatre in 346 (*Dem.* 18.28). Thucydides (5.23.4–5) states that the truce in 421 between Sparta and Athens was to be renewed each year, with the cities sending delegations to the Spartan Hyacinthia and Athenian Dionysia respectively. These festivals were chosen presumably because both the Hyacinthia and the Dionysia were attended by international visitors.⁸ The same logic is likely to lie behind the decision to publicize the treaty with stelae at the Panhellenic sanctuaries at Olympia, Delphi, and the Isthmus (5.18.10).

The Dionysia provided opportunities for the Athenians to display their achievements and thank their benefactors in full view of the

⁵ Following Diggle's emendation ἀγοράσασσι: see Diggle (2004) 297; cf. *DFA*² 265–6; C–S 290; Roselli (2011) 122.

⁶ ἐκφανῆς ἐγένετο πρῶτην ἐν μάρτυσι τῶν Ἑλλήνων πλεόν ἢ τρισμυρίοις, *Pl. Symp.* 175e6–7; see Carter (2011b) 54. The victory is said to have taken place at the Lenaia (*Athen.* 217a), but Sider (1980) 43–6 argues that Plato attempts to give the impression that Agathon's victory occurred at the Dionysia.

⁷ Athenian colonies at Brea in Thrace and on Paros contributed a cow and a phallus to the Dionysia: *IG* I³ 46.16–17 = M–L 49; R–O 29. On the delivery of tribute at the end of the Dionysia see *IG* I³ 34.18–31 = M–L 46; *IG* I³ 68.13–14; Eupolis fr. 254 K–A; *Σ* Ar. Ach. 504a (Holwerda I 1b p. 71); Isoc. 8.82; see Roselli (2011) 125–9; on participation by foreigners and metics see Wijma (2014) 78–83.

⁸ On visitors to the Spartan festivals see Chapter 2.2b. The Greek Mainland.

Greeks as a whole. By the end of the fifth century crowns were being awarded to (mostly foreign) dignitaries in the theatre.⁹ On the other hand, Athenian statesmen could not tolerate public embarrassment in front of such an audience. Cleon supposedly attacked Aristophanes for slandering the city in the presence of foreigners (Ar. *Ach.* 501–8). Aeschines opposed the unconstitutional presentation of Demosthenes' crown at the tragic contests, rather than the Assembly, because it was made in full view of 'the Greeks', an act which added significantly to Demosthenes' dubious prestige.¹⁰ Similarly Demosthenes was outraged at being beaten by Meidias in the theatre in front of so many people, both strangers and citizens.¹¹ In the speech *Against Alcibiades* attributed to Andocides we hear of a similar assault committed by Alcibiades against a rival chorus leader. Again the point to note is that this abuse takes place in full view of not only the Athenian people but also other Greeks (ἐναντίον ὑμῶν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων τῶν θεωρούντων, 4.20). The theatre was a place where visitors came not just to see but to be seen. As with other major festivals, this was true for both audience members and performers.

2. NON-ATHENIAN PERFORMERS

The Dionysia, like most other Athenian festivals, was open to non-citizen performers. The one exception was the chorus. Only citizens, competing as members of their individual tribes (φυλαί), were admitted to the dithyrambic choruses of the Dionysia, and the same was true of the 'chorus leaders' (χορηγοί)—the wealthy Athenians who funded the training and costumes.¹² It is quite possible that the same rules applied to dramatic choruses—the scholiast on the *Wealth*, quoted below, does not note any exceptions—though there may have been more flexibility here given that membership was not organized on the basis of a chorus member's tribe. Chorus members

⁹ e.g. Epiclerus of Cyrene: *IG I³* 125; Thrasybulus of Calydon: *IG I³* 102 = M–L 85; see Wilson and Hartwig (2009) 24 and Wilson (2009a) 9–16; Euagoras of Salamis: *IG II–III²* 20. 29–30 = R–O 11.

¹⁰ οὐδ' ἐναντίον τοῦ δήμου, ἀλλ' ἐναντίον τῶν Ἑλλήνων, Aeschin. 3.33–4.

¹¹ ἐναντίον πολλῶν ξένων καὶ πολιτῶν, 21.74.

¹² οὐκ ἐξῆν δὲ ξένον χορεύειν ἐν τῷ ἀστικῷ χορῷ, Σ Ar. *Plut.* 953 c (Holwerda III 4a p. 155); Andoc. 4.20; Dem. 21.56; cf. *DFA²* 76–7; Kaimio (1999) 47–8.

were amateurs as a rule who, rather than earning a living from the round of festivals, were ultimately tied to the city in which they owned land or earned their main income. Although choruses could be sent abroad to represent their city in festivals, it is unlikely that they toured on a circuit, like poets or actors.¹³ There is some evidence, however, that resident non-citizens could act as chorus members and even chorus leaders at the Lenaea and rural Dionysia.¹⁴

Along with a theatre and prizes, however, this was the sum of what the city provided for the performance of drama.¹⁵ All the other necessary elements, the poet, aulos-player, actors, and chorus trainer, either applied to the city for the right to perform or had to be enticed to compete. For the Dionysia alone, the city required each year poets and aulos players to train, and provide musical accompaniment for, three tragic, five comic, and twenty dithyrambic choruses: an estimated maximum of 1,165 chorus members.¹⁶ That is not to mention the annual dramatic contests at the Lenaea and rural Dionysia, or the choral contests at the Lenaea, Panathenaea, Thargelia, and possibly the Prometheia and Hephaesteia.¹⁷ Athens thus offered professional poets numerous opportunities for employment, in addition to an international audience. For tragedians who wished to appear at the Dionysia, any poet could apply to the archon for a chorus each year in late summer.¹⁸ The training of performers and other preparations may have taken place throughout the winter, although we have little information on the rehearsal process.¹⁹ From the middle of the fifth

¹³ E.g. to Delos: Thuc. 3.104; see Wilson (2000) 44–5; Rutherford (2004) 82–6; (2013) 237–49.

¹⁴ Lenaea: *ἐν δὲ Αθηναίῳ (βαλανείῳ, coniecit Holwerda) ἐξήν, Σ Ar. Plut.* 953c (Holwerda III 4a p. 155); Lys. 12.20; see Kaimio (1999) 46–8; Wilson (2000) 28; Wijma (2014) 70–1. Rural Dionysia: metric chorus leaders at Icaria: *IG I³ 254.3–4*; Eleusis: *IG II–III² 1186.6–14*; see Wilson (2010) 50–1.

¹⁵ On the costs of the feast and prizes see Wilson (2008) 96–105.

¹⁶ Revermann (2006b) 108.

¹⁷ See Wilson (2000) 22–44; the speaker at Lys. 21.1–4 has acted as chorus leader for dithyrambic and pyrrhic choruses at the Thargelia, Dionysia, Little Panathenaea, as well as gymnasiarch at the Prometheia. [Xen.] *Ath. Pol.* 3.4 refers to the existence of *chorēgoi* for the Prometheia and Hephaesteia, which may suggest a choral competition: see Parker (2005) 472.

¹⁸ See [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 56.3, Wilson (2000) 51; on the granting of choruses; cf. Cratinus fr. 17 K–A; Pl. *Resp.* 383d, *Leg.* 817d; Arist. *Poet.* 1449b.

¹⁹ For a description of the recruitment of a boys' dithyrambic chorus see Antiph. 6.11–13; an early fifth-century vase has been thought to show a tragic chorus in rehearsal: New York 27.74 = ARV² 407.18 = MTS² no. AV5 p. 45; Bieber (1941); Wilson (2000) 73.

century, further opportunities at the Lenaea and rural Dionysia would have made this a busy season. The return of spring at around the time of the City Dionysia would have presented a good opportunity for poets to make their departure, if they so wished.

In around 420 Aristophanes declared that he had produced his *Clouds* at Athens first, because of the high esteem in which he held the audience.²⁰ He implies that Athens was not the only possible destination, but the most important. Similarly, Plato indicates that by the late fifth or fourth century Athens was the most significant destination for tragic poets. In the *Laches*, Socrates and his companions have been discussing the skill of fighting in armour. Laches (183a) suggests that if this were something that could be taught, professional teachers would seek to establish a reputation among the Spartans, the most warlike of the Greeks, as this would allow them to earn money in other cities. He compares the weapons-trainers to tragedians, who come to Athens to try to make a name for themselves:

ὅς ἂν οἴηται τραγωδίαν καλῶς ποιεῖν, οὐκ ἔξωθεν κύκλῳ περὶ τὴν Ἀττικὴν κατὰ τὰς ἄλλας πόλεις ἐπιδεικνύμενος περιέρχεται, ἀλλ' εὐθὺς δεῦρο φέρεται καὶ τοῖσδ' ἐπιδείκνυσιν εἰκότως.

Anyone who thinks himself a master at composing tragedies does not wander round in a circle through the other cities around Attica displaying his talents, but, as one might expect, hurries here at once and displays them to these people.

(*Lach.* 183a7–b2)

Athens is not only open to foreign poets based abroad; it is their first port of call. Like Isocrates, Plato emphasizes the importance of the Athenian contests as a venue for the display of skill: Athens was the place to go in order to be known and success there was a crucial first step in establishing an international reputation.

²⁰ καὶ ταύτην σοφώτατ' ἔχειν τῶν ἐμῶν κωμωδιῶν, | πρώτους ἡξίωσ' ἀναγεῖν ὑμᾶς, 522–3. Sommerstein (1982) 187 characterizes Aristophanes' claim as 'preposterous since Old Comedy... was, so far as we know, never produced outside Attica'. Nigel Wilson (2007) 68 has argued that the text is suspect for similar reasons. Yet Aristophanes is not saying that he did produce the play abroad, but only that he could have done. This is in fact perfectly reasonable, since we know of performances of comedy in Sicily, Megara, and possibly the Peloponnese in the fifth century. See Ch. 4.1.a.

One example of an artist who came to Athens for precisely this reason may be the aulos player Potamon of Thebes. His burial stela was erected in Attica, which suggests that he had moved to Athens by around the start of the fourth century (see Ch. 3.2.a). The inscription declared that the Theban had obtained a Panhellenic reputation for his skill in music:

Ἑλλάς μὲν πρωτεύει τέχνης αὐλῶν ἀπένειμεν
Θηβαίῳ Πο<τ>άμῳ, τάφος δ' ὅδε δέξατο σῶμα.

Greece bestowed the first prize for the skill of aulos playing on Potamon of Thebes, and this tomb received his body.

(IG II–III² 8883.1–2)

It is Greece as a whole that is said to have recognized Potamon's ability, rather than the Athenians or Thebans alone. The wording of this epigram may testify both to the Panhellenic composition of the audience at Athens and to the possibilities for travel open to Potamon, even if he chose to settle his family in Attica.

Another individual from the fourth century who laid claim to Panhellenic recognition in similar terms was the historian Theopompus of Chios. He declared that he and the tragic poet Theodectas of Pharselis, who won eight victories in Athens, 'held the first prize in literary and rhetorical education among the Greeks' (τὰ πρωτεύεια τῆς ἐν λόγοις παιδείας . . . ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν, *FGrHist* 115 F 25). The sentiment of Potamon's epitaph is also echoed in another funerary monument from the second half of the fourth century, this time for a young Athenian tragedian, Macareus of the deme of Laciadae. Before his death Macareus had hoped to become the victorious 'charioteer of the tragic art among the Greeks' (ἡνίοχος τέχνης τραγικῆς Ἑλλήσιν, *IG* II–III² 6626.3). As with Potamon, such Panhellenic recognition could have been achieved through victories in Athens, as well as other cities.

In this section we will examine the non-Athenian tragic poets and other performers who were attracted to the festivals of Athens in the classical period. Where did they come from? Were they resident aliens or travelling poets based outside Attica? What proportion of poets and musicians at the Athenian festivals were non-citizens? And how might the ethnic make-up of the contestants have changed over time? To understand how the Dionysia functioned as a Panhellenic festival, we need to know more about the origins and movements of the men who appeared on the Athenian stage.

a. Origins

We know of ninety performers active in Attica c.500–300 who were certainly or possibly non-citizens. Full details are provided in Appendix 2. A few caveats should be noted, however. The record is far from complete due to the fragmented state of our evidence. Not all of these individuals certainly appeared at the Dionysia or the Lenaea, though together they may be said to contribute to the overall picture of the Athenian musical culture in which tragedy was produced. In sixteen cases the origins of performers are disputed or uncertain. The possibility remains that some of these individuals may have been Athenian citizens originally or that they achieved citizenship later in life. The data we possess cannot therefore provide a full or entirely accurate account of the origins of the contestants at Athenian festivals. Its usefulness may be more in suggesting general trends of mobility and possible connections between Athens and other parts of the Greek world. We can, at the very least, ask whether Isocrates was broadly correct in his description of Athens as a gathering place for Greek performers. If he was, then this may help to explain tragedy's dissemination.

Those artists whose origins are certain, or at least uncontested in the surviving record, came from several different regions. These are listed in Table 3.1. Most parts of the Greek world are represented. Unsurprisingly, the home cities of many individuals are within easy reach of Attica. Boeotia, Euboea, Megara, and the northern

Table 3.1. Non-citizen performers in Athens by origin

Location	Tragic Poets	Tragic Actors	Comic Poets	Comic Actors	Dithyrambic Poets	Aulos Players	Others	Total	%
Aegean	2	1	2	0	6	1	5	17	18.9
Asia Minor and the Black Sea	3	0	2	0	1	0	1	7	7.8
Central Greece: Boeotia and Locris	0	0	0	2	4	8	0	14	15.6
Greek West: Italy and Sicily	3	2	2	0	3	1	1	12	13.3
Peloponnese and Megaris	4	0	0	0	5	10	1	20	22.2
Northern Greece	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	4	4.4
Disputed Origins	5	4	6	0	0	0	1	16	17.8
Total	17	7	13	3	20	21	9	90	100

Peloponnese provided a significant number of participants for the Athenian festivals. By contrast, relatively few individuals are known from northern Greece and, most strikingly, none at all from the southern Peloponnese. Other performers, however, travelled a great distance to attend the Dionysia, a trend that appears to have increased over time. In the fourth century, the Greek West provided as many as seven tragic and comic performers (though one of them, Dionysius of Syracuse, is said to have gained his victory as a tragic poet at the Lenaea *in absentia*). The tragic poet Spintharus of Heraclea (whose date is uncertain but who possibly belongs to the late fifth century) and the late fourth-century comic poets Diphilus and Dionysius of Sinope were from the Black Sea coast. From the eastern Aegean came at least one fifth-century tragic poet: Ion of Chios, who competed unsuccessfully against Euripides and Iophon in 428 (*arg. Eur. Hipp.* 25–7). Southern Asia Minor was represented in the fourth century by at least two tragic poets (Phanostratus and Theodectas) and possibly a third (Apollodorus, who is said to have come from the Cilician city of Tarsus).

To some extent the presence of non-citizen performers in Athens can be explained as the result of Athenian political influence among allied states. Ion was personally attached in his youth to Cimon, perhaps the most important Athenian general in the decades following the Persian Wars, with whom he dined on at least one occasion.²¹ This visit can be dated to the 460s, between Cimon's victory at the Eurymedon and his exile.²² A son of Ion, named Tydeus, acted as the leader of the pro-Athenian faction on Chios and was executed by the oligarchic party in 411 (Thuc. 8.38.3). Like Chios, Phaselis—a city on the Lycian coast and home of the tragedian Theodectas—fell under Athenian influence in the fifth century. After the battle of the Eurymedon, it was supposedly established as the limit of Persian rule.²³ A fifth-century inscription details some of the privileges Phaselis

²¹ συνδειπνήσαι δὲ τῷ Κίμωνί φησιν ὁ Ἴων παντάπασι μειράκιον ἦκων εἰς Ἀθήνας ἐκ Χίου παρὰ Λαομέδοντι (Plut. *Cim.* 9.1–5). An account of the argument used by Cimon to persuade the Athenians to assist the Spartans at Ithome in 463 (*FGrHist* 392 F 14 = *Leurini* F 107), which may have been recorded in Ion's *Epidemiae*, can also be dated to this period.

²² See Jacoby (1947) 1–2, who suggests 465 for the dinner at Laomedon's house; cf. Webster (1936) 264; *Leurini* p. 68, favours an earlier date around 477/6.

²³ Plut. *Cim.* 12.3–4; Diod. Sic. 12.4.5; see Hornblower (1982) 122–3; the precise terms of the Peace of Callias are probably a later invention, however.

received as an ally.²⁴ In the fourth century citizens of Phaselis were to be found trading in Athens.²⁵ Outside of the Aegean, allied states in the Greek West included Metapontum, which provided troops for the Sicilian expedition in 413 (Thuc. 7.33, cf. 7.57). In the fourth century, the city also produced at least one tragic actor in Aristodemus.

Csapo and Wilson have recently suggested that cleruchies (colonies of Athenian citizens) may have played an important role in the dissemination of Athenian festival practices.²⁶ Athens played a major role in the foundation of Thurii in southern Italy in 444/3 (Diod. Sic. 12.10.4). In the late fourth century the colony was the home-city of the tragic actor Archias, the comic poet Alexis, and Patrocles, a possible tragic poet. It has been suggested that the tragic actor Neoptolemus was a member of the cleruchy on Scyros in the second half of the fourth century.²⁷ The Athenians had had an interest in the island ever since 476/5, when Cimon colonized Scyros and symbolically removed the relic of Theseus' bones to Athens.²⁸ Other fifth-century cleruchies include that of Sinope in the Black Sea, later the homeland of the comedians Diphilus and Dionysius, where Pericles settled 600 colonists (Plut. *Per.* 20.1–2).

Theatre may on occasion have played a role in diplomatic negotiations between Athens and foreign powers. We know from inscriptions that negotiations between Dionysius of Syracuse and Athens were taking place in 369/8 and that a treaty was concluded in the following year.²⁹ One of Dionysius' tragedies then won first prize at the Lenaea of 367. It is possible that this production (and the decision by the Athenians to grant him the victory) may have been prompted by, or even formed part of, these exchanges. He may also have entered plays during an earlier period of (ultimately unsuccessful) negotiations in the 390s, which were aimed at ending Dionysius' support for Sparta.³⁰ It is probably no coincidence that it was a dithyrambic poet, Cinesias, who proposed that Athens honour the Sicilian tyrant in 394/3.³¹ These diplomatic manoeuvrings resemble those of Archelaus

²⁴ IG I³ 10 = M–L 31. ²⁵ Dem. 35.1.

²⁶ Csapo and Wilson (2015) 354. ²⁷ MacDowell (2000) 210–11.

²⁸ Thuc. 1.98.2; Diod. Sic. 11.60.2; Plut. *Cim.* 8, *Thes.* 36.

²⁹ IG II–III² 103 = SIG³ 159 = R–O 33; IG II–III² 105 = SIG³ 163 = R–O 34.

³⁰ Lys. 19.19–20; for this suggestion see R–O p. 51. Tzetzes, a late source, says that he had come second and third several times before he was finally victorious with his *Ransom of Hector* (*Chil.* 5. 23. 178–82).

³¹ IG II–III² 18.5 = R–O 10.5.

of Macedon. He had allied himself with Athens by 407 at around the same time that Euripides visited the king and staged a play, the *Archelaus*, named in his honour (see Ch. 5.1).³² Just as Dionysius was granted honours and citizenship, Archelaus was awarded the title of *proxenos* of the Athenians, indicating a renewed and close relationship between the two powers.³³

In addition to performers from allied states, however, the participants at the Attic festivals also included visitors from cities nominally outside the Athenian sphere of influence. As well as Dionysius, Dorian Syracuse was home to two other fourth-century tragic poets (Achaëus II and Sosiphanes). On the Greek mainland, the cities of the northern Peloponnese produced a significant number of contestants for the Athenian festivals. From Phlius, for example, came Pratinas, who is said to have competed against Aeschylus and Choerilus in 499–496.³⁴ He is therefore part of the first generation of tragic dramatists that can be securely attested after the semi-legendary Thespis. A report of this contest may have represented the earliest documentary record for the Dionysia available to ancient scholars.³⁵ An early fifth-century date is confirmed by the performances of Pratinas' son Aristias, who—in the manner of Euphorion, Iophon, and the younger Sophocles—produced his father's compositions in 467 (presumably after Pratinas' death) and went on to have a career of his own, gaining at least one victory.³⁶ Sicyon, another city in the same region, is also thought to have produced one tragic poet, Neophron, whose drama on the subject of Medea allegedly formed

³² IG I³ 117.25–32 = M–L 91; Walbank (1978) 460–9; Archelaus' agreement to supply the flagging empire with war materials would have led the way to increased traffic between Macedonia and Athens.

³³ Dionysius: IG II–III² 103.30–5; Archelaus: IG I³ 117.36–8; the same was also true of Archelaus' grandfather, Alexander (Hdt. 8. 137–43); see Wallace (1970) 200 who argues that the proxenia dates from the 480s when Alexander probably supplied Athens with ship-building materials, just as Archelaus was to do in around 407.

³⁴ *Suda* π 349.

³⁵ Ancient records, the *Fasti*, probably went back no further than around 500 BC (see C–S 40; *IRDF* p. 141) and may, therefore, have recorded the date of Pratinas' performance. West (1989) 251 = (2013b) 152 takes 499–496 as the first reliable date for drama from which later compilers of the *Didascalie* worked back to give dates for Thespis, Choerilus, and Phrynichus. The precise dating of Pratinas' first performance, however, has been called into question by Scullion (2002) 81–2. Nevertheless, it seems probable that Pratinas was operating at some point in the early fifth century.

³⁶ Performance 467 BC: *arg.* Aesch. *Sept.* Aristias' later career: see T 2–3 *TrGF*.

the basis for Euripides' play of 431.³⁷ Thebes provided at least seven aulos players for the Athenian festivals. It is no coincidence that a crowd of Theban arrivals in Aristophanes' *Acharnians* (862–9) are made up of aulos players.³⁸ Pronomus was perhaps the most famous of these performers: an artist best known today for his portrait on a superb late fifth-century Attic crater, which appears to show victory celebrations after a satyr play.³⁹ His son Oeniades played for a winning chorus at the Thargelia on at least three occasions in the first half of the fourth century.⁴⁰

Performers at Athens seem to have come, above all, from areas with a strong musical and choral tradition, whether within or outside the Athenian empire. The one major exception is Sparta, but then we know of no Spartan poet or musician from the classical period. In most other cases, there is a correlation between the home cities of tragic poets and those of other participants in Athenian festivals. The tragic poet Achaëus of Eretria, for example, who was active in around the third quarter of the fifth century, came from the island of Euboea. So did Mynniscus of Chalcis, who is said to have acted in Aeschylus' tragedies (*Vit. Aesch.* 15). This man has been identified with the Mynniscus who appears third in the list of victorious actors at the Dionysia, and who therefore probably won the prize in the 440s.⁴¹ Chalcis was also the birthplace of Hypodicus, the first victor at the dithyrambic contests of the Dionysia at the end of the sixth century, and Euius, an aulos player who performed in Athens in 320/19.⁴² The tradition of musical performance on Euboea went back to at least the time of Hesiod (*Op.* 654–7), who won a victory at Chalcis at the funeral games of a local noble. Permanent festivals were established in Eretria and Chalcis by at least the fourth and early third centuries.⁴³

In the Peloponnese, Phlius and Sicyon (the home cities of Pratinas and Neophron respectively) nurtured one dithyrambic poet each

³⁷ Diog. Laert. 3.134; *Suda* v 218; see the full discussion in Appendix 2.

³⁸ See Plut. *Pelop.* 19.1; Polyæn. 1.10; Juba *FGrHist* 275 F 82.

³⁹ Pronomus: Naples 3240 = ARV² 1336.1 = MTS² no. AV25 p. 49; Paus. 9.12.5–6, 4.27.7; Athen. 631e; he is possibly the Pronomus referred to at Ar. *Eccl.* 102; Stephanis 2149.

⁴⁰ *IG* II–III² 3064, *SEG* XXVII.17, XXVI.220; Stephanis 1932.

⁴¹ *IRDF* 2325B.4; see O'Connor 351; Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 142–4; Kaimio (1999) 51–2; Stephanis 1757; *IRDF* p. 154.

⁴² Hypodicus: *Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 46; Sutton 3; Euius: *IG* II–III² 3056; Stephanis 952.

⁴³ *IG* XII/9.189; *IG* XII/9.207 = Le Guen (2001) I 41–56 no. 1.

(Epicurus and Hegemon) and together provided the Athenians with five aulos players. Tegea was the home city of one tragic poet of the fifth century (Aristarchus), as well as an aulos player, Callistratus, who appeared at the Thargelia in 349/8.⁴⁴ From nearby Argos came at least one dithyrambic poet and three aulos players, while Hermione was the place of origin of the dithyrambic poet Lasus and the citharist Epicles, who were both active in Athens at the turn of the sixth century. Although we know of no Sicilian tragic poets from before the fourth century, one of the earliest visitors to Athens from the Greek West may have been the aulos player Midas of Acragas. He was victorious at the Panathenaea at around the start of the fifth century.⁴⁵ Both Aeschylus and Epicharmus were active in Sicily in the decades following his arrival in Athens (see Ch. 4).

How many of these performers were long-term or permanent residents in Athens? No ancient source explicitly states that any of our tragic poets were metics (resident aliens). Acestor, in the late fifth century, is perhaps the most likely example of a metic tragedian. In old comedy he is satirized as an inferior poet, a flatterer, barbarian, and runaway slave.⁴⁶ Aristophanes described a son of Acestor as a foreigner, but elsewhere it is implied that Acestor wishes to be accepted as a citizen.⁴⁷ MacDowell has suggested that he might have been the son of an Athenian man and a foreign woman who had been denied citizenship on the basis of Pericles' citizenship law of 450 BC.⁴⁸

At least some non-Athenian performers were buried in Attica. Theodectas' tomb became a prominent landmark on the road to Eleusis.⁴⁹ He most probably spent an extended period in Attica (it was presumably here that he met Isocrates and Aristotle) though it remains uncertain whether Athens became a permanent home or merely, as for many other intellectuals of this period, a regular destination.⁵⁰ We can be

⁴⁴ Callistratus: *SEG* XXVII.19; Stephanis 1359.

⁴⁵ *Σ Pyth.* 12 Inscr. (Drachmann II p. 263).

⁴⁶ Callias fr. 17 K–A; Eupolis fr. 172.14 K–A; Ar. *Av.* 31; see the full discussion in Appendix 2.

⁴⁷ *ξένος τις*, *Vesp.* 1221; attempt at citizenship: Ar. *Av.* 32; Metagenes fr. 14 K–A.

⁴⁸ MacDowell (1993) 366–7. ⁴⁹ Paus. 1.37.4; [Plut.] *X Orat.* 837c.

⁵⁰ Cicero (*Orat.* 172) believed that Theodectas had studied with Aristotle and there is a story that Aristotle angered Isocrates by luring Theodectas away to his school (*arg. Isoc.* 13). However, Theodectas must have been at least the same age as Aristotle, if not considerably older if we assume that he won a tragic victory around 370 BC (*IRDF* 2325A.45). A passage in Plutarch (*Alex* 17.8) suggests that Alexander knew of Theodectas' work through Aristotle rather than that they were fellow pupils of

more confident, however, regarding the family of the comic poet Diphilus of Sinope. A surviving funerary memorial from the Piraeus (an area popular with metics) lists first Diphilus' father Dion, then (in a later hand) Diphilus himself, and then his brother Diodorus, who seems to have received Athenian citizenship by the time of his death in the third century.⁵¹ This suggests that the family had been based in Attica for at least two generations from the middle of the fourth century. Another fourth-century memorial found near Phalerum (a harbour to the east of the Piraeus) marked the grave of the Theban aulos player Potamon and, in an inscription added by a second hand, his wife Patrocleia.⁵² The epitaph also mentions his father Olympichus and the two men are depicted holding their instruments in a relief on the same stele.⁵³ It is tempting to wonder whether Olympichus, like Dion, may not have also resided in Attica with his son.

Other performers, however, remained permanent residents in their own cities. In Ion we have at least one example of a tragic poet who was certainly not a metic, despite the fact that he visited Athens regularly during his lifetime. He was on Chios when Sophocles visited the island as general in 441 and, judging by the fate of his son, the unfortunate Tydeus, the family remained there after Ion's death. He seems to have preserved a distinctly Chian identity in writing a history of his homeland.⁵⁴ The character portraits of famous Athenians in his volume of biographical sketches, the *Epidemiae*, were possibly intended for a Chian audience.⁵⁵

Many of those who appeared on the Athenian stage visited other festivals on the circuit. Dionysius of Syracuse may have sent his plays on tour not just to Athens but to a number of the other great

Aristotle: οὐκ ἄχαριν ἀποδιδούς ἐν παιδιᾷ τιμὴν τῇ γενομένη δι' Ἀριστοτέλην καὶ φιλοσοφίαν ὁμίλῳ πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα (sc. Theodectas). See Webster (1954) 303.

⁵¹ IG II–III² 10321 = Diodorus T 2 K–A = Diphilus T 3 K–A; O–B 6801, 6811, 6812.

⁵² IG II–III² 8883; cf. Wilson (2007c) 146, who comments that 'Potamon had evidently taken up residence in Athens as a metic, doubtless at least in part because of the greater professional opportunities that city's musical industry afforded.'

⁵³ This man (O–B 2443) may be identical with the Olympichus who is mentioned as an aulos player and pupil of Pindar by the second-century grammarian Aristodemus: *FGrHist* 383 F 13 = Σ Pind. Pyth. 3.137b (Drachmann II p. 80); Stephanis (1938).

⁵⁴ Athen. 603e–604d = *FGrHist* 392 F 6 = Leurini fr. 104; History of Chios: Leurini pp. 60–2; see Jacoby (1947) 4–6, Dover (1986) 32. Ion may have given a particularly Athenian spin to this work by making the founder of Chios a son of Theseus.

⁵⁵ West (1985) 76 = (2013c) 433. Dover (1986) 36 argues that Ion's description of Sophocles may hint at his views on the Athenian empire.

Panhellenic festivals as well (Diod. Sic. 15.7.3). Ion recalled a conversation he had had with Aeschylus at the Isthmian games, which must have taken place in the late 460s before Aeschylus' final departure for Sicily.⁵⁶ As in the past, international festivals and the palaces of wealthy patrons offered tempting opportunities for a poet. In a fragment of elegy Ion praises Dionysus (and his wine) and mentions, in the process, precisely these venues for poetic performance:

αὕτη γὰρ πρόφασις παντοδαπῶν λογίων,
ἧ τε Πανελλήνων ἀγοραὶ θαλαί τε ἀνάκτων

For this [wine] is the reason for learned men from all parts, where there are Panhellenic gatherings and the banquets of rulers . . .

(fr. 26.2–3 West).⁵⁷

Ion himself may have performed at a variety of similar gatherings outside Attica. He almost certainly visited Sparta and composed poetry especially for a Spartan audience. Another of his elegies (fr. 90 Leurini = fr. 27 West) provides a description of a symposium. Ion proposes a libation to various heroes with Spartan associations. These include Heracles, from whom the Spartans collectively claimed descent, and Procles, the son of Aristodemus and founder of the Eurypontid branch of the Spartan diarchy (σπένδοντες δ' ἄγνωνς Ἡρακλεῖ τ' Ἀλκμήνῃ τε, | Προκλεῖ Περσείδαις τ' ἐκ Διὸς ἀρχόμενοι, 5–6). The opening line, which instructs a monarch to rejoice (χαίρετω ἡμέτερος βασιλεὺς σωτήρ τε πατήρ τε), may be directed at a Eurypontid king, probably Archidamus, who reigned through the better part of Ion's adult life from 469 to 428.⁵⁸

⁵⁶ Plut. *de prof. in virt.* 8.79e = Leurini T 3 and F 108. See West (1985) 72 = (2013c) 427. Ion probably devoted a section of his *Epidemiae* to Aeschylus as he did with Sophocles. Σ Aesch. *Pers.* 429 (Dind. P.81.16) cites Ion as a source for Aeschylus' presence at the battle of Salamis.

⁵⁷ On line 2, the word λογίων could conceivably be neuter plural meaning 'learned speeches'; cf. Wilamowitz (1927) 279–81 = (1962) 434–7. However, it could also mean poets/sages in the masculine. For such a use see Pind. *Pyth.* 1.94; *Nem.* 6.45; Hdt. 1.1.1 and 2.3.1. This is view taken by most editors: Leurini p. 50: 'viri res gestas dicendi periti'; cf. Valerio (2013) 69; Katsaros (2007) 229–30. The meaning of line 3 is similarly uncertain. I follow Edmonds' conjecture, also printed by Campbell, of ἧ. West (fr. 26); Leurini (fr. 89) and Valerio (fr. 1) preserve the original manuscript reading: αῖ. Leurini (p. 98) translates this sentence as 'e da allora vi sono riunioni panelleniche e feste di re'.

⁵⁸ See Haupt (1875) 209–10; Koehler (1894); Jacoby (1947) 7–8; Huxley (1965) 31–3; West (1985) 74–5 = (2013c) 430–1; Fisher (1989) 34–5; Bartol (2000). Some scholars have been unwilling to allow a connection with Sparta. Their objections are

In the fourth century, poets may have been equally willing to travel to destinations besides Athens. The name of the tragic poet Phanostratus of Halicarnassus, who won a victory at Athens in 307, has been restored to a list of *proxenoi* of the Delians from the start of the third century.⁵⁹ Theodectas, another poet from Asia Minor, is believed to have returned to the region, specifically Caria, at least once during his lifetime. According to later sources, he appeared at a contest held around 356–353 BC by Mausolus' wife, at which a number of the great orators and poets of the day produced works in praise of her dead husband.⁶⁰ For the occasion, Theodectas composed his *Mausolus*. Theodectas may have followed the precedent of Euripides' *Archelaus* in finding or inventing a mythical figure who shared his deceased patron's name.⁶¹ In some ways the careers of the two poets appear to have been similar. Theodectas' epitaph in Attica echoes two written for Euripides and ascribed to Ion.⁶² Euripides, the Athenian poet, has died in the neighbourhood of the Muses in Pieria and is their servant. Theodectas—a non-Athenian who ends his life in a different home of the Muses—is on the opposite trajectory.

In addition to the tragedians, other performers appear equally mobile. In the fifth century, the poets Pindar, Bacchylides, and Simonides worked for a wide range of patrons, both in the Greek heartland and the Greek West (see Chs. 2 and 4). In Hieron of Syracuse they all shared a patron with Aeschylus (see Ch. 4). In the following generation, the Sicilian Telestes of Selinus, who won a victory at Athens in 402/1, is also said to have toured in Italy.⁶³ Melanippides the younger, whose grandfather directed a winning

based on two assumptions: the first, that Ion the tragedian was too loyal to Athens to praise a Spartan king, and the second, that Spartans and their kings were too austere to contemplate the sort of drinking party Ion has in mind. Wilamowitz (1903) 75 n. 1 and (1927) 282–3 = (1962) 438 suspected that the poem might be by Ion of Samos but the attribution to the Chian Ion has been widely accepted (see West (1974) 173). Whitby (1998) has suggested for similar reasons that Ion may instead have written the poem for the court of the exiled Spartan king Demaratus in Asia Minor. Alternative identifications for the king of line one have also been proposed: a symposiarch: see Leurini p. 53; wine or Dionysus: Nieberding (1836) 69; West (1974) 173; Campbell (1992) 363 n.1; Katsaros (2007) 222–3; Zeus: Whitby (1998) 210. For a more detailed discussion of these possibilities see Stewart (forthcoming).

⁵⁹ Athens: *IG* II–III² 3073; cf. *IG* II–III² 2794; Delos: *IG* XI/4.528.

⁶⁰ Gell. 10.18.5; *Suda* θ 138 and ι 653; see Hornblower (1982) 332.

⁶¹ See Hornblower (1982) 335–6; see Ch. 5.1.

⁶² *Anth. Pal.* 7.43–4 = *FGE* 566–75.

⁶³ Athens: *Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 65; Italy: Apollon. *Hist. Mir.* 40.

chorus in Athens in 494/3, joined Euripides in Macedonia at the end of the fifth century.⁶⁴ Timotheus of Miletus, another contemporary of Euripides, may also have travelled on the poetic circuit, performing in Ephesus, where he is said to have composed a hymn to Artemis, and possibly Macedonia and Sparta.⁶⁵ In the fourth century, many performers travelled to Asia in the wake of Alexander's conquests. The comic actor Lycon of Scarphea, in addition to winning two victories at the Athenian Lenaea from around 350, performed for Alexander at Tyre in 332.⁶⁶ The Euboean aulos player Euius of Chalcis also found favour with the king in Babylon.⁶⁷ After Alexander's death, he played for a successful chorus at Athens in 320/19.⁶⁸

When it came to holding spectacles and sacrifices, Athens did not rely on its citizen body alone, or even its population of resident aliens. Rather, the Athenians benefited from the periodic influxes of foreigners that were common to all major Greek festivals. Through constant arrivals, departures, and returns, Athenians were able to watch and hear what the wider Greek world had to offer. And, perhaps more importantly, developments in Athens were visible and on display to all who wished to see them. It is more than likely that the fame of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides was first spread by fellow poets, travellers, ambassadors, and tourists returning home from the Dionysia.

b. Impact

But what impact did these non-Athenian performers have on the Athenian stage? As we have seen, there is a total of ten poets whose

⁶⁴ Melanippides I: *Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 47; Melanippides II: *Suda* μ 454.

⁶⁵ Ephesus: Macrobian *Sat.* 5.22.4. However, Plutarch (*de superst.* 170 a) claims that the same work was performed in Athens; Sparta: Plut. *Inst. Lac.* 238 c; the anecdote recorded by Plutarch of Timotheus' rejection by the Spartan ephor is likely to be apocryphal, however, as it is also applied to Terpander (*Inst. Lac.* 238 c) and Phrynys (*Agis* 799 f-800 a; *Apophth. Lac.* 220 c; *Prof. Virt.* 84a). On Macedonia see: Plut. *de fort. Alex.* 334b = *Reg. Apophth.* 177b = fr. 801 PMG; Steph. Byz. μ 184 (p. 320 Billerbeck) = Anon. *FGE* 1570-1. Neither source is early or completely reliable. Plutarch's anecdote could have been derived from Timotheus' poetry with no other evidence to support it and the epitaph is unlikely to be original. See Hordern (2002) 4-5, however, who nevertheless does not treat a visit to Macedonia as improbable.

⁶⁶ *IRDF* 2325F.48; Plut. *Alex.* 29.6; O'Connor 319; Stephanis 1567.

⁶⁷ Chares *FGrHist* 125 F4 = Athen. 538f; Plut. *Eum.* 2.2; Polluc. 4.78.

⁶⁸ *IG II-III*² 3056; Stephanis 952.

Table 3.2. Non-Athenian poets in Athens

Date	Number of poets of unknown origin	Number of Athenian Poets	Non Athenian Poets	City of origin
c.500–450	3	5–9	3	
			Aristias	Phlius
			Aristarchus	Tegea
			Pratinas	Phlius
c.450–400	11	15–17	2–7	
			Acestor?	Thrace?
			Achaeus	Eretria
			Ion	Chios
			Meletus?	Thrace?
			Neophron?	Sicyon
			Spintharus?	Heraclea
				Pontica
			Theognis?	Megara?
c.400–350	18	8–9	3–5	
			Achaeus II	Syracuse
			Apollodorus	Tarsus?
			Dionysius	Syracuse
			Patrocles?	Thurii?
			Theodectas	Phaselis
c.350–300	4	0	2	
			Phanostratus	Halicarnassus
			Sosiphanes	Syracuse
Totals	36	29–33	10–17	

origins are undisputed and whose activities in Athens during the classical period are securely attested. There are also seven further possibilities, though there is a degree of uncertainty regarding either their origins or the date at which they were active. These are listed in Table 3.2.

These relatively small numbers, over the course of two centuries, have permitted scholars to treat non-Athenian poets as significant exceptions, yet exceptions nonetheless. As Taplin notes, our ten poets account for just over 10 per cent of the ninety-five poets listed in *TrGF*.⁶⁹ Yet this analysis is somewhat misleading, since it fails to take account of the fact that the origin of many of these poets is unknown.⁷⁰ There are actually only around thirty poets who were

⁶⁹ Taplin (1999) 35.

⁷⁰ Allan and Kelly (2013) 91 n. 57 appear to have made a similar error when they claim that out of forty-nine fifth-century poets in *TrGF* I, forty-two are Athenian. The names of the seven non-Athenian poets are not listed.

certainly Athenian citizens. The list in *TrGF* also includes nine other poets and philosophers (Hippias of Elis, Plato, Empedocles of Acragas, Polyidus of Selymbria, Diogenes of Sinope, Philiscus of Aegina, Crates of Thebes, Python, and Heraclides Ponticus) but there is no evidence that any of their tragedies (if they existed) were performed at Athens.⁷¹ Their names are therefore not included here as those of possible tragic poets. If we exclude all of these uncertain cases, our list of seventeen poets produces a figure of 34 per cent out of a total of fifty poets. The lower option of ten poets out of forty-three would account for just under a quarter. Even if we assume that four uncertain cases—Meletus, Acestor, Theognis, and Philocles—were in fact citizens, 21 per cent of all poets would still be non-Athenians. This final figure assumes the lowest number of non-Athenian and the highest number of Athenian poets. One cannot be too cautious in drawing inferences from such unreliable and incomplete data; however, on the basis of the evidence available it is possible to conclude that between a fifth and a third of all tragedians in Athens in the classical period could have been non-citizens.

An even higher proportion of dithyrambic poets are likely to have been non-citizens. Plutarch even remarks on the strange fact that Athens never raised a melic poet of equal standing to her dramatists (*de gloria Ath.* 348b). In his list of poets, Sutton includes only six Athenians from the classical period.⁷² By contrast, we know of as many as twenty non-citizens who directed choruses at Athens. The Athenians were equally dependent on foreign aulos players. Wilson has argued that they had an ambivalent relationship with the aulos: the instrument was present everywhere at Athens and yet somehow it was seen as unsuitable for citizens.⁷³

⁷¹ Hippias: *TrGF* I 42; Plato: see *TrGF* I 46; Empedocles: *TrGF* I 50; Heraclides: *TrGF* I 93; Diogenes: *TrGF* I 88; Crates: Diog. *TrGF* I 90; Python: *TrGF* I 91. One might also add Arion, Mimnermus, Pindar, and Simonides to the list of possibilities: see *TrGF* I 227, 246, 260, 263.

⁷² Lamprocles (12); Cinesias (22); Telesias (35); Lysias (51); Speusades (55); and Pamphilus (57).

⁷³ Wilson (1999); (2002) 47–8; e.g. Alcibiades' rejection of the *aulos*: Plut. *Alc.* 2.5–7. On the intellectual value of the *aulos* see Arist. *Pol.* 1341b; Athen. 337e. Socrates bewitches his audience like an *aulos* player, Pl. *Symp.* 215b–c. Aristotle claims that after the Persian wars the Athenians did indulge in playing the *aulos* but that they were to reject it later (*Pol.* 1341a). To some extent this claim may be influenced by prejudice against professional *aulos* players: cf. [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1141c–e; ἀλλητῶν καὶ χορευτῶν μισθοφόρων κατεχόντων τὰς ὀρχήστρας, Athen. 617b. For the hyporchema

The numbers of non-Athenian tragic poets appear to have remained steady throughout the fifth and fourth centuries.⁷⁴ One major change is that poets are prepared to travel further to reach Athens in the fourth century, which may point to the enhanced prestige of the tragic contests at the Dionysia. However, the proportion of non-citizen poets does not noticeably increase in the fourth century. The largest concentration of possible foreign poets occurs in the second half of the fifth century and is paralleled by a similar spike in the number of known citizen tragedians. This is due in part to the importance of old comedy, and especially Aristophanes, as a source, however problematic it may be in practice. The early fourth century, by contrast, is a comparatively quiet period in terms of participation by Athenian and non-Athenian poets alike. The first truly outstanding Athenian poets after the death of Sophocles seem to have been Astydamas, who won his first victory in 372, and the younger Carcinus, who probably preceded Astydamas in the victors' list.⁷⁵ The most successful tragedian before them may have been the younger Sophocles, who won seven victories, two of which are recorded in the *Fasti* for the years 387 and 375.⁷⁶ Only a single fragment of his work has been preserved by later generations. Possible reasons for this downturn may be the straitened economic situation in Athens at the turn of the century, the shock of defeat in 404, and the strain of war in the following decade. The second half of the fourth century sees a drop in Athenian poets, yet the numbers of non-Athenians remain steady. The 'internationalization' of the Athenian tragic competitions cannot, therefore, be termed a late development.

The numbers of non-citizen performers as a whole also seem to have remained fairly constant. The figures are displayed in Table 3.3.⁷⁷

of Pratinas, which Athenaeus quotes, see fr. 3 *TrGF* = fr. 708 *PMG*. In addition, many, outside the competitions, were women and slaves. See Pl. *Symp.* 176e, 212d, 215c; Xen. *Symp.* 2.1; on aulos players at symposia see Jones (1991) 190–1; on women players see Rocconi (2006). The fourth century *phiale* inscriptions preserve a record of two female metic musicians: Agora Inv. I.4763.7; *IG* II–III² 1557.63; Meyer (2010) 83–7. In addition we have the record of a metic maker of *auloi* from the same set of inscriptions (Agora Inv. I 3183 A).

⁷⁴ Roselli (2011) 135 alleges that the fourth century saw an increase in non-Athenian performers but does not provide any evidence to support this contention.

⁷⁵ *IRDF* 2318.1477; 2325A.44.

⁷⁶ *Suda* σ 816; *IRDF* 2318.1007 and 1153.

⁷⁷ Out of our original total of ninety possible non-citizens, I have excluded sixteen cases where the home-city is disputed or uncertain and six instances where a date is

Table 3.3. Non-citizen performers in Athens by date

Location	Tragic Poets	Tragic Actors	Comic Poets	Comic Actors	Dithyrambic Poets	Aulos Players	Others	Total	%
c.500–450	3	0	0	0	7	1	2	13	19.1
c.450–400	2	1	1	0	3	3	4	14	20.6
c.400–350	3	0	1	0	6	7	2	19	27.9
c.350–300	2	2	5	3	4	6	0	22	32.3
Total	10	3	7	3	20	17	8	68	100

There is an overall increase in the number of non-Athenians in the fourth century. This, however, is due in part to the increasing prominence of actors as a profession (see Chapter 6.1b). Five out of six possible non-citizen tragic and comic actors belong to the second half of the fourth century. The epigraphical evidence for aulos players likewise dates largely to the fourth century and may skew the numbers here. By contrast the figures for dithyrambic poets, like tragic poets, are largely unchanging, with ten individuals known from the fifth century and ten from the fourth.

The main exception is in comedy, where there is a definite increase in the numbers of non-Athenian comic poets in the latter half of the fourth century.⁷⁸ We know of only one non-citizen comic poet from the fifth century, Hegemon of Thasos, and he is more regularly mentioned as an early composer of mythical parodies (Arist. *Poet.* 1448a12–13). Judging by what we know of the works of Aristophanes, comedy in the fifth century seems to have consisted of topical dramas largely aimed at local audiences. Yet even in old comedy there are signs that poets could at least aspire, in jest or otherwise, to a Panhellenic reputation. The chorus of the *Acharnians* claims that the fame of the poet who abuses his countrymen has spread abroad to other cities (641–2). They add that the king of Persia is one of Aristophanes' admirers.⁷⁹ Aristophanes sees himself as a potential benefactor of Athens and other cities: indeed he supposedly received a

uncertain or cannot be precisely established (the tragic poets Neophron and Spintharus, and the aulos players Aratus, Ariston, Chares, and Lycus).

⁷⁸ See Nervegna (2013) 33.

⁷⁹ *Ar. Ach.* 647–51; *Vit. Ar.* XXVIII.45–6 and XXIXa.32–3 (Holwerda I 1a pp.135; 138); see Lefkowitz (2012) 108.

crown for the wisdom of the *parabasis* in *Frogs*.⁸⁰ To a certain extent, this fits the mould of the wandering professional poet, even if in practice Aristophanes' primary audience was Athenian citizens.

Beyond the numbers, we may wish to know what kind of artistic contribution was made by non-citizens to the Athenian musical culture. Given the absence of surviving tragic texts, any attempt to answer this question must ultimately be inconclusive. As was the case with Athenian poets, their work probably varied in quality. Many of the tragic poets recorded, however, won victories. Theodectas' achievement of eight successes out of thirteen competitions, as recorded on the epitaph on his tomb, is an especially high success rate and one comparable with those of Aeschylus and Sophocles.⁸¹ However, there is no direct correlation between the number of victories and the perceived abilities of a tragedian: Euripides, despite his undoubted success, won on only five occasions. Simply obtaining a chorus is likely to have been an important achievement in itself.⁸²

Comedy is another possible indicator of a poet's impact on the audience at Athens. Lines from tragedies by Achaëus and Ion were quoted, on two occasions each, by Aristophanes, suggesting that their works were well known to the audience.⁸³ Trygaeus in Aristophanes *Peace* (835–7) of 421 notes that the Athenians, prompted by one of Ion's dithyrambs (fr. 84 Leurini = fr. 745 PMG), referred to him as 'Dawn Star' following his demise. The scholiast concludes that he was much talked about.⁸⁴ His works may have remained popular two decades after his death, since Ion is quoted twice in the *Frogs* of 405. Other poets receive less sympathetic treatment. Acestor and Dionysius were both mocked, specifically for their inadequacies as poets.⁸⁵ Yet even negative comments may testify to a certain notoriety among the contemporary theatre crowd.

⁸⁰ Vit. Ar. XXVIII.40 and XXIXa.28–9 (Holwerda I 1a pp.135 and 138); Ar. *Ran.* 718–37.

⁸¹ Steph. Byz. p. 660 Meineke = FGE 1572–5.

⁸² Wright (2009) 158–9; cf. Stevens (1956) 91–2 on Euripides and his relatively few victories.

⁸³ Achaëus; *Ran.* 184 = fr. 11 TrGF and *Vesp.* 1081 = fr. 29 TrGF; Ion; *Ran* 706 = fr. 41 TrGF and 1425 = fr. 44 TrGF.

⁸⁴ περιβόητος δὲ ἐγένετο Σ Ar. *Pax* 835–837b (Holwerda II 2 p. 129).

⁸⁵ Acestor: Callias fr. 17 K–A; Dionysius: Ephippus fr. 16 K–A; Eubulus fr. 26 K–A; cf. Diod. Sic. 15.6.1, 7.3, 7.4; see Hunter (1983) 116–17.

The judgement of later writers is similarly mixed. Achaëus was certainly read and appreciated in the following centuries, since no fewer than twenty titles are preserved. In the late fourth or early third century the philosopher Menedemus (who was also from Eretria) was fond of his satyr plays, which he ranked the best bar those of Aeschylus alone.⁸⁶ The titles and fragments of six of these satyr dramas have been preserved with two others that are less certain.⁸⁷ Ion was highly regarded as a tragic poet, even if he was not quite of the first rank. To show that poets can be excellent, and yet be surpassed by the truly great masters, Longinus (*de Subl.* 33.5) uses two pairs of examples: Bacchylides and Pindar, and Ion and Sophocles. Bacchylides is the lesser of the lyric poets while Ion is the lesser of the tragedians. It is significant that Ion is remembered here primarily as a tragic rather than a lyric poet, despite his known versatility.⁸⁸ A similar (though more amicable) rivalry to that between Pindar and Bacchylides is imagined between the two tragedians, perhaps inspired by the meeting between Sophocles and Ion in the *Epidemiae*.⁸⁹ While the comparison is in some senses critical, it also testifies to the high regard in which his plays were held. Many would be proud of such mediocrity.

Dionysius is the only non-Athenian who, despite his one victory, was believed to have failed as a tragic poet. The little information we have on his qualities as a poet is undoubtedly affected by the ancient accounts of his reign, in which he appears as a caricature of barbarity and despotism. His severity as a tyrant and efficiency as a soldier are ludicrously juxtaposed with his passion for the poetic arts. For later authors his tragedies provided ironic reflections on the tyrant's own life: Plutarch turned against Dionysius the traditional maxim found in one of his tragedies that tyranny was the mother of injustice.⁹⁰ Given this negative tradition, it is impossible to make a fair assessment of Dionysius' achievements as a poet.⁹¹ Despite their poor reputation, his plays were preserved and read in later periods.⁹²

⁸⁶ Diog. Laert. 2.133.

⁸⁷ Fr. 3–5, 5a–11, 12–15, 16b–17, 19–23, 26, 27–8, 32–5 *TrGF*.

⁸⁸ *Dieg.* 9.32–38 in Callim. *Iamb.* 13 (fr.205 Pfeiffer) = Leurini T 15a–b; cf. *Ἴων ὁ τραγικός* Strabo 14.1.35.

⁸⁹ Athen. 603e–604d = *FGrHist* 392 F6 = Leurini F 104.

⁹⁰ Fr. 4 *TrGF* = Plut. *de Alex. fort.* 338b. On similar expressions cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 534; Soph. *OT* 872, Eur. fr. 437.

⁹¹ For a recent reassessment see Duncan (2012).

⁹² See Dearden (1990) 234. Cicero was aware of his prodigious output (*musicorum vero perstudiosum accepius*) but does not comment on how bad or good it might be

As far as we can tell from the surviving fragments, the tragedies of non-Athenian poets differed little from those of their Athenian rivals. In the case of Achaeus, his *Athla*, if it is in fact a satyr play, may have resembled Aeschylus' *Isthmiaeae/Theōroi*, in which the satyrs abandon their usual habits in order to compete at the Isthmian Games.⁹³ From the little we know of the subject matter of other plays, we can see that they did not differ greatly from works composed by Athenians. Heracles appeared in all likelihood in two of his tragedies while the myths of the Epigoni and Alcmeon were presumably the subject of his *Alcmeon* and *Alphesiboa*.⁹⁴ He also wrote an *Oedipus* (fr. 30–1 TrGF), although not much can be said regarding its content. His *Philoctetes* seems to have been set at Troy rather than on Lemnos and it may have resembled Sophocles' *Philoctetes at Troy* (fr. 697–703 TrGF).

Ion, like the Athenian tragedians, chose myths that were distinctly Panhellenic.⁹⁵ The subjects favoured most by this Chian seem to be the myths of Troy and Heracles. The influence of Homer is, unsurprisingly, as evident in these plays as it is in those of the Athenian dramatists. In a fragment of his *Agamemnon* a cup is mentioned (ἐκπωμα δακτυλωτόν, ἄχραντον πυρί, fr. 1.2 TrGF). Didymus compared this line to *Iliad* 23.270 (ἀμφίθετον φιάλην ἀπύρωτον) in order to explain Ion's curious description.⁹⁶ He also wrote an *Alcmene* (as did Aeschylus and Euripides), a *Teucer* (as did Sophocles), and at least one play concerning Phoenix (as did Euripides). His *Guards* possibly concerned the capture of the Trojan Palladium by Odysseus. The story is mentioned in the *Rhesus* (506–7) and Euripides' *Hecuba*.⁹⁷

(*poetam etiam tragicum—quam bonum nihil ad rem*, *Tusc.* 5.63). Cicero was aware that his plays were held in low esteem, yet the main point is that any poet, however bad, can take pleasure in his own works. *De gustibus non est disputandum* seems to sum up Cicero's attitude to the works of Dionysius.

⁹³ *Athla*: fr. 3–5 TrGF; *Isthmiaeae*: Aesch. fr. 78a–82 TrGF.

⁹⁴ Heracles: fr. 26 TrGF, where the satyrs address Heracles. Achaeus also wrote an *Omphale* (fr. 32–5 TrGF) which may have had a similar plot to that of Ion. Alcmeon: for the story of Alcmeon as a common tragic theme see Aristotle *Poet.* 1453a. It was treated by Euripides, Sophocles, Agathon, and Astydamos. Among foreign poets Theodectas (fr. 1a–2 TrGF) wrote an *Alcmeon*. An unknown Timotheus, conceivably the famous lyric poet from Miletus, staged an *Alcmeon* and an *Alphesiboa*, probably in the deme of Aexion; see *IG* II–III² 3091.6; *DFA*² 54–6 and Csapo (2010a) 92.

⁹⁵ As noted by Stevens (2007) 257.

⁹⁶ Athen. 468c–f; Hesych. δ 145 Latte.

⁹⁷ A line preserved by the scholiast to Aristophanes' *Frogs* (σιγά μὲν, ἐχθαίρει δέ, βούλεται γέ μὴν fr.44 TrGF = Leurini fr. 53.) is spoken by Helen to Odysseus. The unknown person who preserves a hostile silence is possibly Hecuba. In Euripides'

Ion's satyr-play *Omphale* seems to have dramatized Heracles' period of servitude to the Lydian queen as detailed in Sophocles' *Trachiniae* (248–90) and scholars have long suspected a link between the two plays.⁹⁸ Ion's drama certainly made use of at least one conventional theme of satyr play: Heracles and his appetite. A fragment is quoted in Athenaeus' discussion of this subject, in which the hero is reported to have eaten firewood and charcoal (items which had perhaps been provided for a sacrifice).⁹⁹

Non-Athenian tragedians may have been in the minority at the Dionysia, yet they were a significant minority nonetheless. Many produced plays that were judged by contemporaries to be of a similar quality to those of their Athenian counterparts. Far from being outsiders, they had an intimate knowledge of the genre and the broader Greek poetic traditions of which tragedy formed a part.

CONCLUSION

The importance of Athens, in cultural as in political and economic terms, is best measured by its impact on the world known to and inhabited by the Greeks as a whole. Athens was an open city and a hub for travelers. Exchanges of ideas, like exchanges in commercial wares, could only have been enhanced by the presence of foreigners at the festivals of Attica. The continuous arrival and departure of

Hecuba (239–50) Odysseus is said to have begged Hecuba for her life after she discovered his identity. Ion may have staged this scene in his play. See Stevens (2007) 250–8.

⁹⁸ See Webster (1936); Maitland (2007) 275–6. The play included a description of Euboea (fr. 18 *TrGF* = Leurini F 23), which could perhaps have included Oechalia as well and, if so, could thus contain an allusion to Heracles' eventual fate, as related in the *Trachiniae*. It is probable that in the plot of the *Omphale*, Heracles had already been on Euboea in order to compete in Eurytus' archery contest (Soph. *Trach.* 262–9). Alternatively, in this fragment Heracles may be describing his journey from Delphi to Lydia via Euboea: see Krumeich et al. (1999) 489. Ultimately, it is just as likely that the two derived from a common source. The myth of the archery competition and the sack of Oechalia pre-dated the fifth century. See Davies (1991) xxii–xxvii. The earliest reference may be *Od.* 8.224–5. Bacchyl. 16.16–18 (Maehler) also alludes, like Sophocles, to the headland on Euboea where Heracles put on the poisoned cloak. Maehler (2004) 167 argues that Sophocles' version may have inspired Bacchylides.

⁹⁹ Fr. 29 *TrGF* = Athen. 10. 411b–c.

foreigners likewise maintained Athens' position within a network of Greek cities.

The tragic contests at Athens were hardly parochial celebrations. The city almost certainly played a key part in the dissemination of tragedy to the wider Greek world. Not all visitors to Athens were passive tourists: a variety of communities outside Attica provided many of the aulos players, poets and actors needed for the city's festivals. The only bar to entry concerned the choruses, and even here we find exceptions. Otherwise there appears to have been a mix of citizens and non-citizens participating in almost all the elements of the festival.

The dissemination of tragedy should not be thought of as a late development; nor did tragedy spread outwards from Athens in one direction only. In actual fact, non-Athenians were contributing to the overall development of the genre from the very beginning. Far from witnessing an Athenian export of tragedy, we have seen Greek tragedians come to Athens. In the following chapters, we will examine the other side of the story: how Athenian poets left Attica to perform elsewhere. It is this travel—by both sets of poets and in both directions—that ultimately made tragedy Greek.

Tragedy outside Attica c.500–450 BC

INTRODUCTION

This chapter concerns performances of tragedy outside Attica in the early fifth century. For Athenian poets, as for their predecessors, opportunities for employment, display, and enrichment were available in more than one city, if they were willing to move. Potential venues for the performance of tragedy could be found in a multitude of festivals, both new and well established. Wealthy patrons were able and, in some cases, eager to fund dramatic contests, as well as the more traditional choral competitions. And, perhaps unsurprisingly, non-Athenian forms of theatre were already emerging in the early fifth century. Communities outside Attica thus played an active role both in the development and the dissemination of tragedy. Not only did they attract poets from abroad, they also nurtured tragedians and other dramatists from among their own citizens.

It was not only the poet, but also his compositions that were adapted to travel. The subject matter of tragedy was ideally suited to appeal to audiences abroad. Tales of mythical heroes and their travels were familiar to the Greek peoples as a whole. Yet, more importantly, these stories, like the wandering poets themselves, created connections between cities and incorporated their audiences within the mythical history of the wider Greek nation. We will consider two sets of tragedies from this period that appear to conform to this pattern: the *Aetnaeae* and the *Persians* trilogy of Aeschylus. These are likely to have been performed in Sicily and are thus important early examples of tragedies produced for audiences outside Attica.

1. DRAMATIC PERFORMANCES OUTSIDE ATTICA

a. The Greek Mainland

In the first half of the fifth century we know of at least two non-citizen tragedians at Athens from Phlius, Pratinas and his son Aristias. We have seen that Pratinas can be dated to a very early period in the history of tragedy, long before the genre is commonly believed to have spread outside Attica. One other tragedian may also have been active around 450: Aristarchus of Tegea. What role then did the Peloponnese, the homeland of Pratinas, play in the dissemination, and even development, of tragedy as a Greek art form?

Athens did not produce tragedy in isolation: rather the Dionysia was part of an interconnected network of festivals, which were linked through travel. The presence of these poets in Athens testifies in part to the vitality of local choral and musical traditions in the Peloponnese. Composers of tragedy, who were expected to produce verse in a variety of metres and train a chorus, required a set of skills that were almost identical to those of the traditional lyric poet. Pratinas is known to have celebrated the Spartan choral tradition and was the author of a work entitled *Dysmainae* or *Caryatids* (711 PMG = Athen. 392f).¹ This play is likely to have involved Sparta and choral poetry in some way: Caryae was the location of a Laconian festival which included dances for Artemis, while *Dysmainae* are said by Hesychius to be female Bacchic dancers in Sparta.² Battezzato has documented allusions to Spartan ritual and choral performance in Euripides' *Helen* (1353–68), which suggest that the audience of tragedy at Athens was assumed to be familiar with some distinctive elements of Spartan festivals by at least the late fifth century.³

Although Athenians would become the most accomplished tragedians, many of the fundamentals of the art were not their own invention. In the Peloponnese, as at Athens, early choral traditions appear to have preceded—and possibly contributed to—the development of drama. Herodotus refers to the performance of tragic choruses (Hdt. 5.67.5) in the early sixth century at Sicyon. This city, the supposed home of Neophron, was situated on the Corinthian Gulf

¹ Λάκων ὁ τέττιξ εὐτυχὸς ἐς χορόν, fr. 4 TrGF = 709 PMG = Athen. 633a.

² αἱ ἐν Σπάρτῃ χορίτιδες Βάκχαι Hesych. δ 2600; see Constantinidou (1998) 22.

³ Battezzato (2013) 106–10.

not far north of Phlius. The choruses are mentioned briefly in the context of Cleisthenes' reforms to the hero cult of Adrastus at Sicyon:

τά τε δὴ ἄλλα οἱ Σικυνῶνιοι ἐτίμων τὸν Ἄδρηστον καὶ δὴ πρὸς τὰ πάθρα
αὐτοῦ τραγικοῖσι χοροῖσι ἐγέραιρον, τὸν μὲν Διόνυσον οὐ τιμῶντες, τὸν δὲ
Ἄδρηστον.

In other respects the Sicyonians used to honour Adrastus and celebrated his sufferings with tragic choruses, honouring not Dionysus but Adrastus.

(5.67.5)

When an oracle prevented Cleisthenes from expelling the cult of the Argive king, he instead resorted to transferring these tragic choruses to the cult of Dionysus. It is far from clear what we are to make of this tantalizing notice. It may be, as Pickard-Cambridge supposed, that in the fifth century Herodotus encountered or knew of choruses at Sicyon that bore a close resemblance to tragedy, that were held in honour of Dionysus (as at Athens), and which were believed to date from before the establishment of the Athenian tragic contests.⁴ The nature and extent of this resemblance remains uncertain: it could be that the choruses were similar in subject matter only or that the performance involved some limited form of *mimesis*.⁵ Whether these choruses were thought of as 'tragic' at the time of Cleisthenes is unknown. Yet whatever their precise nature, such performances are likely to have influenced the productions of Pratinas at Athens. If so, this may be one instance of a link between two independent poetic centres.

There is good evidence for comedy outside Attica from at least the fifth century. Megara was the site of a rival comic school to that of Athens, and one that was satirized by Aristophanes and other Athenian poets.⁶ Aristotle (*Poet.* 1448a31) notes that the Dorian Megarians claimed to have invented the genre. A number of Corinthian vase paintings dating to around 625–550 lend some support to this view. They depict padded dancers, who are often accompanied by aulos players.⁷ Athenaeus, quoting the third-century historian Sosibius of Sparta (*FGrHist* 595 F 7), mentions an old form of Spartan comedy that was also known by different names in Sicyon, Italy and Thebes.⁸

⁴ Pickard-Cambridge (1962) 102–3.

⁵ The latter possibility, suggested by Ridgeway (1910) 28–9, was rejected by Pickard-Cambridge.

⁶ Ar. *Vesp.* 57; τὸ δράμα Μεγαρικόν, Ecphantides fr. 3.2 K–A; Eupolis fr. 261 K–A.

⁷ See Kerkhof (2001) 13–50; Rusten (2006) 40–1; Rothwell (2007) 20–5.

⁸ παρὰ δὲ Λακεδαιμονίοις κωμικῆς παιδιᾶς ἦν τις τρόπος παλαιός, Athen. 621d.

Quite how ancient this form of comedy was, and whether it was really comparable to comic drama, is uncertain.⁹

By at least the fourth century, the Peloponnesians had begun to articulate rival claims to the invention of tragedy. According to Aristotle (*Poet.* 1448a29–b1), their argument relied on the etymology of the word ‘drama’ (δράμα) from the supposedly Doric verb meaning ‘I do | act’ (δράω), the Attic equivalent being πράττω. Aristotle neither endorses this (rather dubious) theory, nor does he dismiss it as incredible; rather he simply notes the Dorian claim in passing to show the importance of action and plot in tragedy. An alternative account of the origins of drama, recorded in the *Suda* (θ 282), attributes its invention not to the Athenian Thespis but to a citizen of Sicyon, Epigenes. West suggested that the source for this account may have been the fourth-century sophist Heraclides Ponticus. This author knew of a monument in Sicyon that listed early (and in some cases mythical) poets.¹⁰ A similar tradition makes Arion, who was closely associated with Corinth and Periander, the development of tragedy.¹¹ Pratinas was credited by the *Suda* with the invention of satyr plays, and it is for these works that he and Aristias were chiefly remembered in the time of Pausanias.¹²

Most of the evidence for the Dorian claim is later than the fifth century and some of the stories may be deliberate inventions. What is more significant, however, is that the cities of the northern Peloponnese were able and eager to appropriate both tragedy and comedy. And they could make a good case: their festivals were known in some cases to have predated the Athenian Dionysia and they had the texts to prove that their poets were composing tragedies (or poetry similar to what later became tragedy) from an early period. In the fifth century, the same developments that brought about the foundation of the tragic contests in Athens were also taking place elsewhere, especially

⁹ See Olson (2007) 4–5.

¹⁰ [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1131f; see West (1989) 252 = (2013b) 153.

¹¹ Solon fr. 30a West; *Suda* α 3885.

¹² *Suda* π 2230; Paus. 2.13.6. Aristotle asserted that tragedy evolved by abandoning its earlier satyric roots (διὰ τὸ ἐκ σατυρικοῦ μεταβαλεῖν 1449a22). However it is unlikely that this refers to satyr plays: for one thing, as Seaford (1998) 11 notes, we would expect the plural if it did. Aristotle is probably thinking of komastic and Dionysiac elements typical of the early dithyramb, from which, he believed, tragedy developed. Johan Schloemann, in Krumeich et al. (1999) 76, has suggested that Pratinas’ contribution may have been to mix Attic and Peloponnesian elements to form a new hybrid drama.

in the northern Peloponnese and Megaris. While the Dorians may not have invented tragedy, as they claimed, they certainly nurtured some of the first tragic poets and appear to have staged early forms of drama that could be described as tragic and comic by later authors. Given the Athenian Dionysia's importance in the fifth century as a regional and increasingly Panhellenic festival, it is unlikely that Athenian poets would have remained ignorant of these developments for long.

b. The Greek West

The first Athenian tragic poet known to have travelled outside Attica was Aeschylus. His destination was Sicily. What drew him there and what did he find on his arrival? In this section, we will see that both choral and dramatic competitions were already in place at the start of the fifth century. In addition, the wealth of Sicily and the largesse of its tyrants made the island an attractive destination for Aeschylus and his contemporaries.

We saw in Chapter 2 that by the fifth century the Greek West had already played host to a series of poets from the mainland. It could also boast an impressive poetic tradition in its own right. A lead curse tablet from Gela or Camerina attests to the existence of musical competitions, in Sicily.¹³ It is dated from the letter forms to around 470–450 (and was therefore conceivably written during Aeschylus' lifetime or shortly after his death). The text is confusing in the extreme and a number of interpretations are possible. What we can say for certain is that contests (*ἀγόνων*) are mentioned as are chorus leaders (*χοραγοί*), although unfortunately we cannot be entirely certain of the meaning of the term here.¹⁴ A liturgical context on the Athenian model, funding either drama or other choral art forms, is a possibility.¹⁵ Another inscription of the same period from Camerina

¹³ Text edited by Jordan (2007), translation and analysis by Wilson (2007b). On the date see Jordan (2007) 336–7.

¹⁴ ἐπὶ φιλότατι τῷ Εὐνίῳ ἀπογαράφο τὸς χοραγὸς πάντας 3–4; see Jordan (2007) 343 and 346–7. Wilson (2007b) 352 translates these lines as 'For love of Eunikos I mark down all the *choragoi* so that they may be ineffectual both in word and deed, along with their sons and fathers; and so that they fail both in the contest and outside the contests.'

¹⁵ Alternative explanations: 'leader of the choral performance' e.g. Athen. 14.633b; 'trainer' e.g. Poll. 9.41–2. Jordan (2007) 346 suggests that Eunikos may be the young

records a certain Thrasus, a member of the Emmenid clan, who was the best of the singing Doristonphoi.¹⁶ This may also point to a choral competition in a festival context. As in other parts of the Greek world, participation in such competitions formed a key part of ancient education. According to the lexicographer Pollux, the Dorians tended to use the word for choral training area (*χορηγεῖον*) to mean a school in general (*διδασκαλεῖον*). He cites as evidence two plays by Epicharmus, the early fifth-century Sicilian comic poet.¹⁷

At least some of these festivals included dramatic competitions by the time of Aeschylus' visit. Aristotle believed that the comic plot, as opposed to the earlier comic-style iambics, developed first in Sicily.¹⁸ This type of performance was represented chiefly by the works of Epicharmus, whom Aristotle notes was active long before the earliest Athenian comedians.¹⁹ Of the organization of Sicilian dramatic competitions we know painfully little. The origins of the stone theatre at Syracuse have been much disputed.²⁰ A temporary wooden construction, such as those known from Attic inscriptions, could have accommodated productions of the works of Epicharmus and Aeschylus equally well.²¹ A fragment from Epicharmus mentions five judges, who were understood by Zenobius as those tasked with judging the comic poets.²² This suggests a comic competition, at which prizes were awarded, as at Athens. We may also add Plato's comment (*Leg.* 659c) on the (far too democratic) method of judging dramatic

star of the chorus and Apellis his trainer and lover. For pederasty and choruses see Aeschin. 1.9–11; Wilson (2000) 56.

¹⁶ SEG XLII.846.

¹⁷ *ὡς Ἐπίχαρμος ἐν Ὀδυσσεὶ αὐτομόλῳ, ἐν δ' Ἀρπαγαῖς χορηγεῖον τὸ διδασκαλεῖον ὠνόμασεν*, Poll. 9.42 = Epicharm. fr. 13 K–A.

¹⁸ *τὸ δὲ μῦθος ποιεῖν . . . ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκ Συκελίας ἦλθε*, *Poet.* 1449a6–7.

¹⁹ *ἐκείθεν γὰρ ἦν Ἐπίχαρμος ὁ ποιητὴς πολλῶν πρότερος ὢν Χιωνίδου καὶ Μάγνητος*, *Poet.* 1448a33–4.

²⁰ Parts of the later retaining wall and a temple above the site of the Hellenistic theatre have been dated to the sixth century: see Voza (2001). Cuttings discovered in the vicinity of the orchestra of the Hellenistic theatre at Syracuse, once thought to be the remains of an earlier fifth-century stone construction, are now generally thought to be from the Roman period. For recent discussions and bibliography see Marconi (2012) 179–80; Csapo and Wilson (2015) 332–3.

²¹ See e.g. *IG* II–III² 1176 + *SEG* XIX.117 + *SEG* XXI.521: a contract dated 324/3 BC sold by the deme of Piraeus for the construction of wooden seats at the theatre. For wooden theatres in general and the fifth-century theatre of Dionysus see Csapo (2007) 103–8.

²² *ἐν πέντε κριτῶν γούνασι κείται*, fr. 237 K–A = Zenob. *Vulg.* 3.64.

competitions in Sicily and Italy by the volume of applause that greeted each offering.

Epicharmus' contribution to the development of comedy, and particularly Old Comedy produced at Athens, is evident even in the few fragments that survive. The comic parasite makes his first known appearance in his *Hope* or *Wealth* (fr. 32 K–A), and it may be that other stock characters of Athenian comedy also appeared on the Sicilian stage.²³ What is most striking, however, is the number of works concerned with mythical subjects: perhaps as many as twenty-four titles out of a total of forty-one known plays.²⁴ Mythical burlesques, while not represented in the extant works of Aristophanes, are known from Athenian Old Comedy, with Cratinus' *Dionysalexandros* being perhaps the best example.

Parallels can also be made with tragedy and especially satyr plays. Epicharmus certainly made fun of Aeschylus' poetry on at least one occasion.²⁵ Equally, Athenian authors were aware of the works of Epicharmus by the late fifth century.²⁶ The fragments of his works are too few to allow us to conclusively demonstrate a direct link between Sicilian comedy and tragedy. What they do suggest, however, is that both Sicilian and Athenian dramatists were drawing from a shared mythical and performance tradition, though in different ways. In terms of subject matter, Epicharmus and Aeschylus both wrote a *Bacchae*, *Persians*, *Sphinx*, and *Philoctetes*.²⁷ Of the *Persians* by Epicharmus we know virtually nothing, yet it is not impossible that it referenced Aeschylus' tragedy or the *Phoenician Women* by Phrynichus. It may be significant that Aeschylus' *Sphinx* was a satyr play. The *Thearoi* of Epicharmus (fr. 68–9 K–A) could perhaps have resembled another satyr play of Aeschylus, the *Theōroi* or *Isthmian Competitors*.

In Sicily, as in Athens, choral and dramatic competitions were sustained by the wealthy and powerful: those with substantial private

²³ See Pickard-Cambridge (1962) 281–2; Kerkhof (2001) 165–70; Olson (2007) 55; Boshier (2014) 85.

²⁴ See Kerkhof (2001) 116.

²⁵ Epicharmus fr. 221 K–A; see Willi (2008) 166–7; for possible interactions between the poetry of Epicharmus and Pindar see Svarlien (1990).

²⁶ He is quoted by Xen. *Mem.* 2.1.20 = fr. 236 and 270 K–A; Pl. *Th.* 152d–e = fr. 136 K–A; see Olson (2007) 10–11.

²⁷ Epicharmus: *Bacchae* (fr. 16–17 K–A); *Persians* (fr. 110–11 K–A); *Sphinx* (fr. 125–6 K–A); *Philoctetes* (fr. 131–2 K–A).

resources or the resources of the state itself to call their own. Most important were the great tyrants: principally Gelon and Hieron of Syracuse, two brothers from the powerful Deinomenid family, and Theron, the Emmenid ruler of Acragas. Epicharmus was particularly associated with Hieron: in his play the *Islands* he appears to have praised the tyrant's efforts to restrain Anaxilas of Rhegium from punishing the citizens of Locri.²⁸ In addition to Epicharmus, foreign poets linked to Hieron include Pindar, Simonides, Bacchylides, Aeschylus, and possibly the tragedian Phrynichus.²⁹

The Deinomenids of Sicily, in acting as hosts to famous poets, were carrying on a long-standing tradition of aristocratic patronage.³⁰ Pisistratus and his sons had laid the foundations for Athens' future artistic brilliance in much the same way. We can learn something regarding Hieron's patronage of the arts from the epinician poets he commissioned to celebrate his athletic victories. Pindar states that a number of poets have made the journey to Hieron's opulent Sicilian estate.³¹ He emphasizes that Hieron cannot win everlasting fame cheaply.³² Maintaining a poet was no small matter in itself; but that was not all. A chorus was probably required for the performance of at least some of the epinician odes of Pindar.³³ It is likely that many of these works were performed publicly, especially in the case of odes for victors as important as Hieron. Even nominally private symposia could involve choral performances.³⁴ Victory celebrations could equally have taken place within the context of festivals.³⁵

²⁸ Fr. 96 K–A = Σ Pind. *Pyth.* 1.99a (Drachmann II p. 18); on the political context of Epicharmus' poetry see Bosher (2014) 86. Epicharmus is listed as a contemporary of Hieron by ancient chronographers: *Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 55; Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1.64.2.

²⁹ See Svarlien (1990); on Phrynichus see Appendix 3.

³⁰ Hubbard (2004) 82–4.

³¹ ἐς ἀφνειὰν ἰκομένους | μάκαιραν Τέρωνος ἐστίαν, Pind. *Ol.* 1.10–11; cf. *Pyth.* 5. 11.

³² e.g. *Pyth.* 1. 90; see Carey (2007) 203–4; the same point is also made by Simonides in Xenophon's dialogue *Hieron* 9.11.

³³ On the problem of the performance of epinician see Lefkowitz (1963) and (1988); Davies (1988) 56–7; Heath (1988); and Heath and Lefkowitz (1991), who argue for purely monodic performance within the context of the symposium. Carey (1989), (1991) and Burnett (1989) offer alternative arguments supporting the traditional view. In all likelihood Pindar's clients may have had more than one option for performing their victory odes.

³⁴ e.g. Xen. *Hier.* 6.2; see Clay (1999).

³⁵ For epinicia performed at public festivals see *Ol.* 9. 108–12, *Pyth.* 11. 1–6; *Nem.* 10. 21–3; cf. Currie (2004) 64–9, (2011) 272 and Carey (2007) 205 who argues 'it is

Choral competitions were perhaps funded in the same way as the victory odes.

At around the time of Aeschylus' arrival in Sicily in the 470s, Hieron was channelling some of his resources into poetic commissions designed to advertise his achievements. These were principally his athletic victories, the founding of a new city at Aetna in 476, and the defeat of a combined Carthaginian and Etruscan fleet at Cumae in 474, a victory which rivalled Gelon's triumph over the Carthaginians at the battle of Himera six years previously. The foundation of Aetna is frequently referred to by both Bacchylides and Pindar. The latter addresses Hieron as the city's 'glorious founder'.³⁶ This desire to commemorate the colony alongside the tyrant's athletic triumphs echoes Hieron's own wish to be announced as a citizen of Aetna, rather than Syracuse, on the occasion of his Pythian victory in 470.³⁷

It is possible that Hieron invited some of these poets to appear at contests on the occasion of the settlement of Aetna. A parody of a city foundation in Aristophanes' *Birds* (904–59) may point to such an event. No sooner has Pisetaerus named his new city and begun the ceremonial sacrifices for Clouduckooland, then a poet appears offering his services. The man claims he has brought with him a wide variety of material, including compositions for circular and maiden choruses (917–19). Presumably he is hoping that Pisetaerus will grant him a chorus from among the members of the new city. He advertises himself as a servant of the Muses (*Μουσάων θεράπων*, 909), just as Bacchylides had claimed to be a servant of the divine (*χρυσάμπυκος Οὐρανίας | κλεινὸς θεράπων*, 5.13–14 Maehler), when he celebrated Hieron's Olympic victory in 476 (the same year as the foundation of Aetna).³⁸ This conforms to the common notion of the poet as a

inherently implausible that a grand song of praise . . . was squandered on an informal gathering'. The whole city was liable to glory in an athlete's victory, not merely his immediate family, and it is possible that the populace was included to some extent in the celebrations. See Kurke (1991) 6–7; Golden (1998) 81–2 and Swift (2010) 109–11. Hubbard (2011) argues for the public performance of Pindar's other poetry. On the performative and dramatic aspect of all Greek poetry see Herington (1985) 3–40.

³⁶ *κλεινὸς οἰκιστήρ*, *Pyth.* 1.31; Cf. *Pind. Pyth.* 1.60; *Nem.* 9.2 and fr. 105a S–M; *Αἴτναν ἐς εὐκτιτον*, *Bacchyl.* fr. 20c.7 Maehler.

³⁷ *Pind. Pyth.* 1.32–3; 3.69.

³⁸ Cf. *πρόπολος Μουσάν*, 5.192–3 Maehler. This is a common term for a poet, however: cf. *Margites* fr. 1.2; *Hom. Hy.* 32. 20; *Hes. Thgn.* 100; Choerilus fr. 317 Suppl. *Hell.* The poet notes at *Av.* 910 and 914 that it is in the manner of Homer (*κατὰ τὸν Ὅμηρον*). See Dunbar (1995) 529–30.

professional devoted to his craft, rather than merely a paid hireling. In reality, however, Aristophanes' poet swiftly turns out to be something of a parasite, crossing the carefully delineated line between poet and beggar, as is usual in comedy.³⁹ He requests, as his fee, clothing to keep him warm on his travels through the icy city of the birds (949–50): a comic parody of the lyric poet's claim to hospitality.⁴⁰ Pisetaerus is, as it turns out, justifiably disturbed that the news has got out so quickly, since it suggests that other parasites will come to plague him (956–7).

The link between Pisetaerus and Hieron is made explicit in the poet's choice of verses for the occasion—a hyporchema of Pindar's cunningly reworked to make the mercenary nature of his offer all the more blatant:

σὺ δὲ πάτερ, κτίστορ Αἴτνας,
ζαθέων ἱερῶν ὁμώνυμε,
δὸς ἐμὶν ὅ τι περ τεῶ κεφαλῇ θέλῃς
πρόφρων δόμεν.

And you great father, founder of Aetna, whose name evokes holy rites [a pun on Hieron], give to me with your assent whatever you wish to give.

(926–30 = Pind. fr. 105 a–b S–M)⁴¹

The poet adapts Pindar's verses in order to hint that Pisetaerus should be generous, presumably as his predecessor Hieron was before him. We may wonder if Aristophanes is parodying an actual event: the gathering (whether summoned or not) of poets to mark the founding of Aetna in 476. In Hieron's case, this event could well have taken the form of a celebratory choral performance, like those for epinician victors, or a musical competition within the context of a (new) city festival, either at Aetna or Syracuse. A possible contender is the festival dedicated to the cult of Zeus Aetnaeus, which is attested in the Pindaric scholia.⁴² It may have been at this festival that Pindar's

³⁹ Dover (1972) 141: this passage provides 'the stock comic picture of a lyric poet... as a parasite dependent for his living on eloquent flattery of the rich and powerful'. See Dunbar (1995) 521; cf. *Ar. Nub.* 334–8; *Pax* 967–9; Dover (1968) 146. Hieron complains about this type of entertainer in Xenophon's dialogue, *Hier.* 1.13; 11.10.

⁴⁰ Appeals for clothing: Hipponax fr. 32–34 West; cf. the cloak given by Eumaeus to Odysseus *Od.* 14. 459–61. On gifts of clothing in Homer see Block (1985).

⁴¹ On Aristophanes' parody of Pindar see Dunbar (1995) 532–3; Martin (2009) 94.

⁴² On Zeus Aetnaeus: Pind. *Ol.* 6.96, *Nem.* 1.6; see Wilamowitz (1922) 296–8; Braswell (1992) 37; Hutchinson (2001) 419; Currie (2005) 18, (2011) 274–6; on the

first *Pythian* and the first *Nemean* odes were performed. A scholion on Pindar states that it was also a contest (*ἀγών*), which might suggest competitions in other poetic genres.⁴³

It may have been in this context that Aeschylus produced his tragedy the *Aetnaeae*. The *Vita* ties the first performance of the *Aetnaeae* directly to the founding of Aetna in 476:

ἐλθὼν τοίνυν εἰς Συκελίαν Ἱέρωνος τότε τὴν Αἴτνην κτίζοντος ἐπεδείξατο
τὰς Αἰτναίας οἰωνίζομενος βίον ἀγαθὸν τοῖς συνοικίζουσι τὴν πόλιν.

Having gone to Sicily at a time when Hieron was in the process of founding Aetna, he produced the *Aetnaeae* predicting a good life for those settling the city.

(*Vit. Aesch.* 9 TrGF)

Here Aeschylus' activities fit the long-established model of the travelling professional at the court of the foreign ruler, as satirized by Aristophanes. Later authors, such as Pausanias (1.2.3), saw Aeschylus as part of precisely this tradition: Aeschylus and Hieron had followed Anacreon and Polycrates as examples of ideal poets and patrons. They would be succeeded in their turn by Euripides and Archelaus.⁴⁴

Aeschylus was generally believed in antiquity to have known Sicily well and he is likely to have made repeated visits to the island during his lifetime. Athenaeus and Eustathius attributed to Aeschylus an intimate knowledge of Sicily, thus explaining the appearance of words from Western Greek dialects in his works.⁴⁵ To the scholiast on Aristophanes' *Peace* Aeschylus was virtually a native Sicilian.⁴⁶ Aeschylus' biographer, however, attempts to condense the reports of his travels into one 'exile' at the end of his life, when he left Athens in

festival of Zeus Aetnaeus: ἐν τῇ Αἴτνῃ Διὸς Αἰτναίου ἄγαλμα ὕδρευται, καὶ ἑορτὴ Αἰτναία καλεῖται, Σ *Ol.* 6. 162a (Drachmann I p. 192); Σ *Nem.* 1.7b (Drachmann II pp. 11–12).

⁴³ Ζηνὸς Αἰτναίου χάριν: ἢ εἰς χάριν τοῦ Διός, ἢ ἔνεκεν τοῦ Διός, παρόσον ἐν τῷ ἀγῶνι καὶ ἐν τῇ πανηγύρει τοῦ Αἰτναίου Διὸς ᾗδον οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἱέρανα τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῖς στεφανίταις ἀγῶσι πεποιημένους ἐπινίκους, Σ *Nem.* 1.7b (Drachmann III pp. 11–12).

⁴⁴ Aeschylus is similarly included in Plutarch's list of poets who benefited from going into exile in a foreign city (*de exil.* 604e–605b); for similar comparisons see [Pl.] *Ep.* 2.311b; Plut. *non posse suaviter vivi* 1095d.

⁴⁵ Athen. 402 b; Eustathius s.v. *Od.* 19. 439. On Sicilian Greek dialect in Aeschylus see Stanford (1937/8). Griffith (1978) 107–9 argues that few or none can be said to have been exclusively Sicilian.

⁴⁶ τρόπον δέ τινα καὶ Αἰσχύλος ἐπιχώριος, Σ *Ar. Pax* 73b (Holwerda II 2 p. 20). The same comment ('vir utique Siculus') is also made by Macrobius *Sat.* 5.19.17.

a fit of pique following his defeat by Sophocles or Simonides.⁴⁷ Yet ancient scholars also connected the first recorded performances of tragedy outside Athens, Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae* and his *Persians* with Hieron.⁴⁸ The tyrant died in 467, but Aeschylus' death and burial in the Sicilian city of Gela is only thought to have occurred in 456.⁴⁹ At least two visits, around the time of Aetna's foundation in 476 and after 458, are likely, while a third, following the Athenian production of *Persians* in 472, is possible.⁵⁰ The, probably erroneous, story of the 'exile' may be part of a common *pharmakos* tradition, in which the poet is treated as his home-city's scapegoat, driven out (often unjustly) to prevent some calamity from befalling the community.⁵¹

Why did Aeschylus travel to Sicily? The answer must be that it was the obvious destination for a professional poet. All of the great performers of his generation were converging on the island. The gatherings of poets before the doors of Hieron should be seen as a

⁴⁷ Vit. Aesch. 8; Plut. Cim. 483f. The *Suda* (at 357) suggests that Aeschylus left Athens after the dramatic collapse of the stage mid-performance.

⁴⁸ *Aetnaeae* see Vit. Aesch. 9 TrGF; *Persians*: Vit. Aesch. 18 TrGF. See van Leeuwen (1890); Wilamowitz (1897); Huddilston (1898) 66; Stanford (1937/8); Herington (1967); Bremer (1991) 40–1; Taplin (1993) 2–3; Easterling (1994) 73; Kowalzig (2008) 129; Hanink (2010a) 48–53.

⁴⁹ FGrHist 239 A 59; Vit. Aesch. 11 TrGF.

⁵⁰ For a full discussion see van Leeuwen (1890) and Herington (1967). Herington (1967) 76 suggested that the celebration of Aetna's foundation could have been delayed to around 470, and, if so, that the *Aetnaeae* and *Persians* were performed on the same visit. Boshier (2012c) has recently argued that the *Persians* was first performed with the *Aetnaeae* in Sicily in 475 and only re-performed later in Athens in 472 (a suggestion also made by Wilamowitz (1897) 396). A first performance in Sicily is not inherently improbable. However, the arguments she puts forward are not very compelling. In particular, Boshier argues that the *Persians* is an unusual play, but that is partly because it is our earliest extant tragedy and not because of any Sicilian characteristics. She suggests that the epiphany of Darius could only have been possible in a theatre with a tunnel under the orchestra. Such a tunnel has not been discovered at Athens. However, the emergence of Darius from within the tomb could just as easily have been managed by a trap-door in the stage or some other contrivance. An Attic vase produced at least a decade before *Persians* shows such an epiphany taking place (Basel Antikenmuseum BS 415). Finally, she notes that the other plays performed with *Persians* in Athens in 472 dealt with mythological subjects and that their plots were unconnected. She assumes that *Persians* was performed on its own first in Syracuse and then the other plays were tacked on for the Athenian production. However, the plays shared similar themes and were probably performed together in Sicily: see Sommerstein (2012) and my discussion below.

⁵¹ See Compton (2006) 3–18, 135–41. On *pharmakoi* see Parker (1983) 258–71 and Burkert (1985) 82–4.

continuation of the tradition of the wandering singer.⁵² There is every indication that Aeschylus found in Sicily a discerning audience, ample festivals, experienced choruses, and a patron with the ambition and resources to fund poetic performances. Moreover, it is no coincidence that in both Sicily—the first region to be visited by an Athenian tragic poet—and the Peloponnese—the origin of the first non-Athenian tragedian—we find a longstanding tradition of choral performance and early experimentations in drama. The poetic traditions and festivals of Attica, the Peloponnese, and Sicily developed simultaneously, and to some extent independently, but were also interconnected from an early period through the travels of Aeschylus and his contemporaries.

2. THE PLAYS

a. Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae*

The biographical tradition most probably drew on the texts of Aeschylus as its main, if not its only, source for the travels of Aeschylus. The *Vita*'s author may show some awareness of the play's content when he claims that the *Aetnaeae* predicted good fortune for the citizens of Aetna. This suggests an aetiological prophecy made by a god in the closing scene. Pindar makes a similar prediction—which he asks Apollo to confirm—that, after Hieron's victory at Delphi, the city he founds may be as successful as the founder (*Pyth.* 1.35–40). Unlike Pindar, Aeschylus could not build his work directly around the foundation, but he could allude to it, and in doing so he was conceivably echoing Pindar and other poets who competed with him for the tyrant's attention.

⁵² Scholars have sometimes been unwilling to acknowledge the similarities in the careers of Aeschylus and his contemporaries. Rehm (1989) 32–3 has cautioned us against ignoring what he calls 'the fundamental difference between the genre of the epinician . . . and that of tragedy'. Unlike the older and more traditional 'poetry of praise', he argues, tragedy grew hand-and-glove with the new democracy at Athens and, as a result, carried with it a particular social and political agenda. For explanations for Aeschylus' Sicilian interludes involving Athenian politics see Kowalzig (2008). Duncan (2011) 72, however, has questioned this assumption, claiming that it is motivated merely by 'the desire to rescue Aeschylus as the champion of democracy'.

The little we know of the play's content and the myth it covered seems to support the *Vita's* account. The play concerned in some way the Palici, Sicilian chthonic deities, whom the Greeks identified as children of Zeus and the nymph Thalia.⁵³ Their mother's father was Hephaestus, who is associated with Mount Etna by both Pindar and the author of *Prometheus Bound*.⁵⁴ The Palici were linked to a volcanic spring that pushed water up from under the ground to a great height.⁵⁵ When the mother of the Palici became pregnant by Zeus, she was so distraught at the threat of Hera's anger that she asked for the earth to open and swallow her. Her children then re-emerged from the ground and from this they were known as Palici from the Greek 'to come back' (πάλιν ἰκέσθαι).⁵⁶

Fraenkel added to the *Aetnaeae* the fragments of an unidentified play of Aeschylus concerning the arrival of Justice on earth.⁵⁷ This identification has not been universally accepted, yet it is an attractive proposition nonetheless.⁵⁸ A chorus converse with the personified Justice, who claims to have been sent by Zeus to their city. Another fragment may describe the honour shown to a city by Justice and the

⁵³ On the cult see Croon (1952).

⁵⁴ Steph. Byz. π 1 (p. 6 Billerbeck); [Aesch.] *PV* 366–9; Pind. *Pyth.* 1.25. Hephaestus and Demeter were said by Simonides (fr. 552 PMG) to have made competing claims to the island.

⁵⁵ Diod. Sic. 11.89. 1–4; Strabo 6.2.9; Steph. Byz. π 1 (p. 6 Billerbeck).

⁵⁶ Macrobius *Sat.* 5.19.24 = Aesch. fr. 6; Steph. Byz. π 1 (p. 6 Billerbeck) = Aesch. fr. 7; Servius ad Verg. *Aen.* 9.581. For similar puns cf. Pind. *Pyth.* 1. 62–5, where the river Amenes is derived from the Greek ἀεὶ μένειν in order to suggest that Aetna will flourish *in perpetuum*. See Dougherty (1991) 126–7.

⁵⁷ *POxy.* 2256 fr. 9a–b = fr. 281a–b *TrGF*; Fraenkel (1954); followed by Lloyd-Jones (1983) 99–100.

⁵⁸ This suggestion has been rejected by Taplin (1977) 464–5 and Poli-Palladini (2001) 315–16. A major objection is that, according to Lobel (s.v. *P.Oxy.* 2256 fr. 9a p. 39), the language is closer to satyr play than tragedy. In particular, Lobel pointed to the use of the word ὀτίη (fr. 281a 9 *TrGF*) which also appears in Euripides' *Cyclops* (643) but not in any tragedy; cf. Sutton (1983) 21; Krumeich et al. (1999) 98–106; and Poli-Palladini (2001) 313–14. This would rule out a link with the *Aetnaeae*. On the other hand, the celebration of future prosperity in the *Aetnaeae* is a theme suitable for a satyr play. There is nothing to suggest that the *Aetnaeae* was not a proper tragedy, but it is not impossible that it could have had satyric elements. Euripides' *Alkestis* is one known example of a pro-satyric tragedy and there may have been others. Like Euripides in the *Alkestis*, Aeschylus included scenes of drunkenness in his tragedy the *Cabeiri* (see Athen. 428f; Deforge (1987) 39–40). Aeschylus is also not above using words otherwise unattested in serious poetry in the *Eumenides* and elsewhere (e.g. βδελύκροποι, *Eum.* 52 and ἀβδελυκτα, fr. 137 *TrGF*; ἐμοῦσα, *Eum.* 184). For arguments in support of Fraenkel's identification see Lloyd-Jones (1983) 99–100 and Ippolito (1997) 10–11.

happiness, peace, and prosperity resulting from her attention.⁵⁹ Fraenkel argued that these fragments were especially suited to the *Aetnaeae*: a ‘Festspiel’ celebrating the foundation of Aetna.⁶⁰ The theme of justice may have been only too appropriate given the establishment of a new Dorian constitution for the city of Aetna, as is described in Pindar’s first *Pythian*.⁶¹ The ‘Justice play’ also celebrated peace: the result of the arrival of Justice. The papyrus seems to refer to the birth of Ares, who is presumably defeated or reformed by Justice.⁶² Similarly, in Pindar’s ode, the myth of Typhos, who is placed under Aetna by the victorious Zeus Aetnaeus, suggests the imposition of order and justice over chaos. Music, in Pindar’s ode, banishes War, just as Hieron, as the victor of Cumae, has brought peace to Sicily. The ‘Justice Play’ therefore seems to touch on themes that would have been only too suitable for a play celebrating the foundation of a city, and which, moreover, were addressed by Pindar in his celebration of Hieron’s achievements. Moreover, the Palici were said to assist in the administration of justice and, in particular, the punishment of oath-breakers.⁶³ In the play, the establishment of their cult could have prepared for the advent of Justice.

Like many other tragedies, the play concerned and indeed dramatized travel. It began in Aetna but then moved across Sicily, through Xuthia, Aetna again, and Leontini, ending at Syracuse.⁶⁴ Ultimately any reconstruction of the play must be speculative. What is not in doubt, however, is the journey across eastern Sicily, which suggests that Aeschylus was at pains to include multiple communities in a pan-Sicilian celebration. One possible scenario is that the disappearance of Thalia into the earth prompted the chorus (consisting presumably of nymphs from Mount Etna) to tour these areas of Sicily in search of their lost companion.⁶⁵ Perhaps they met the newly risen Palici at Leontini or Xuthia: two of the settings for the play, both

⁵⁹ *P. Oxy.* 2256 fr. 8; Fraenkel (1954) 74–5 = (1964) 261–2.

⁶⁰ Fraenkel (1954) 71 = (1964) 258–9.

⁶¹ *Pyth.* 1.61–6; Σ 118c (Drachmann II p. 20). See Fraenkel (1954) 69–70 = (1964) 257.

⁶² *P. Oxy.* 2256 fr. 8. 2; fr. 9a 30–41; see Sommerstein (2010c) 208 n. 47.

⁶³ *Diod. Sic.* 11.89.5–8; *Macr. Sat.* 5.19.20.

⁶⁴ *P. Oxy.* 2257. fr. 1.8–14; see Fraenkel (1954) 63–4 = (1964) 250–1. For a discussion of the problems of staging see Taplin (1977) 416–18.

⁶⁵ See Ippolito (1997) 8; Poli-Palladini (2001) 311; Sommerstein (2010c) 193.

of which are in the vicinity of their shrine at modern Contrada Rocchicella.⁶⁶ The sanctuary of the Palici was, in part, an oracular shrine and the chorus could have been sent there for advice or directions.⁶⁷ The prediction of good fortune for the future city of Aetna could either have come from the Palici or even, if we are right to add the 'Justice Play' fragments to *Aetnaeae*, a personified Justice. The culmination of the drama may have involved a celebration of Syracuse and its role in setting up the new colony.

In ending the play in Syracuse, Aeschylus may have stressed the importance of this city, as the main base of Aetna's future founder, in the broader network of communities under Hieron's control. In this regard, the *Aetnaeae* may resembled the *Eumenides* in its themes and plot. This later play dramatized Orestes' journey from Delphi to Athens and the foundation of the homicide court of the Areopagus and cult of the Eumenides.⁶⁸ As the ancient hypothesis seems to have noted, in the two plays the action takes place in more than one location.⁶⁹ Both dramas probably ended on a positive note after a period of uncertainty, with a vision of a community strengthened by the twin powers of Justice on earth and a chthonic cult beneath it. Syracuse, as the setting for the conclusion of the *Aetnaeae*, could have taken the role of Athens in the *Eumenides* and received many of the same benefits.

And yet, by setting the play in several locations, Aeschylus seems to have created a Sicilian, rather than merely Syracusan or Aetnaean, tragedy. The cult of the Palici, whose sanctuary provided a shared focus for worship for the various Greek and indigenous populations of eastern Sicily, seems to have provided the ideal myth with which to focus the attentions of Aeschylus' Sicilian audience. The *Aetnaeae* thus suggests ways in which tragedy could be used to unite and to celebrate simultaneously the origins of more than one community.

⁶⁶ See Croon (1952) 116; Fraenkel (1954) 64 = (1964) 251; La Rosa (1974); Poli-Palladini (2013) 19.

⁶⁷ Macr. Sat. 5.19.22.

⁶⁸ Cf. Poli-Palladini (2001) 319, 324, who notes that both plays employ strikingly 'propagandistic' devices.

⁶⁹ *P.Oxy.* 2257.6 is tentatively restored by Lobel to εἰς Ἀθήνας ἐκ Δελφῶν μεταβιβάζεται. This, he argues, refers to the *Eumenides*.

b. Aeschylus' *Persians* and its Trilogy

While the *Aetnaeae* was Sicilian in its content, the *Persians* and its trilogy were more obviously Panhellenic. It formed part of what Taplin has termed the Panhellenic 'celebration culture' of the victorious Greek states, following the victories at Salamis, Himera, and Plataea in 480 and 479.⁷⁰

The *Persians* was believed by the third-century scholar Eratosthenes to have been re-performed in Sicily at Hieron's request.⁷¹ A scholion on Aristophanes' *Frogs*, reports this information as part of an attempt to explain Dionysus' confusing reference to the death of Darius (1027–8)—an event which clearly featured neither in our extant text nor that known to ancient scholars. The author suggests that Aristophanes is referring to a different version of the play performed for Hieron. The theory of a revised text of the play is unlikely and it is more probable that the problem came about through an early corruption in the text of Aristophanes.⁷² Nevertheless, a reperformance of the *Persians* in Sicily seems plausible and while Eratosthenes is a comparatively late source he is generally regarded as a scholar of sound judgement.⁷³

There are good reasons why Hieron might have been keen to stage the *Persians* in Sicily. Like the *Aetnaeae*, it would have fitted well with Hieron's overall political agenda. Although the play celebrates Athens' contribution to the Greek cause, especially in Atossa's conversation with the Chorus on the strengths of the democratic Athenian state (230–45), Hieron could have seen the *Persians* as a reflection of his family's achievements in the combined struggle against barbarian forces.⁷⁴ The play celebrates the joint victory of the Greek states.

⁷⁰ Taplin (2006).

⁷¹ δοκοῦσι δὲ οὗτοι οἱ Πέρσαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Αἰσχύλου δεδιδάχθαι ἐν Συρακούσαις, σπουδάσαντος Ἰέρωνος, ὥς φησιν Ἐρατοσθένης ἐν γ' περὶ κωμωδιῶν. Σ *Ran.* 1028f (Holwerda III 1a p. 127); φασὶν ὑπὸ Ἰέρωνος ἀξιωθέντα ἀναδιδάξαι τοὺς Πέρσας ἐν Σικελίᾳ καὶ λίαν εὐδοκιμεῖν, *Vit. Aesch.* 18 TrGF.

⁷² See Garvie (2009) liii–lvii. Broggiato (2014) has suggested amending the words περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεώτος (*Ar. Ran.* 1028), which suggest an announcement 'about the death of Darius', to παρὰ Δαρείου τεθνεώτος, meaning 'news from Darius who was already dead'. This would refer to Darius' prediction of the Persian defeat at Plataea (*Aesch. Pers.* 805–20).

⁷³ See Broggiato (2014) 9.

⁷⁴ Lattimore (1943) 90–3 claimed that the pro-Athenian bias of the play wilfully obscures the collaborative efforts made by the Greek states. E. Hall (1996a) 12, points

Victory at Salamis safeguards the freedom of all Greece, not just Athens. The rallying cry at Salamis is directed to all Greeks (ὦ παῖδες Ἑλλήνων, 402). Although the credit for Salamis is reserved largely for Athens, Darius predicts that the future defeat at Plataea will be caused by the 'Dorian spear': a reference to Sparta.⁷⁵

Aeschylus could also have had in mind the victories won in Sicily by Hieron and his brother Gelon. We are told that on the same day that Persian arms received their first major reverse at Salamis, Gelon crushed a Carthaginian force at Himera. This was followed six years later by Hieron's own naval victory at Cumae.⁷⁶ According to Diodorus Siculus, Gelon's victory against the barbarian Carthaginians at Himera was thought by many to rival those at Salamis and Plataea.⁷⁷ Although Gelon had turned down requests for help against the Persians (Hdt. 7.157), Himera was publicized as another Hellenic victory on a different front against a common enemy. It was claimed that the Carthaginians had allied themselves with the Persians and were acting in conjunction with them.⁷⁸ Gelon dedicated a tripod of sixteen talents of gold at Delphi alongside those of the cities of mainland Greece.⁷⁹ An Etruscan helmet, part of the spoils of Hieron's Italian campaigns, was similarly offered to Zeus at Olympia.⁸⁰

Hieron probably intended to use poetry to publicize his family's achievements and stress their equal worth among the Greek peoples. It seems likely that Pindar and Aeschylus were collaborating or competing in this programme. Taplin argues that Aeschylus, with his first performance of the *Persians* in Athens, may have been hoping to promote the relatively new genre of tragedy within the context of the victory celebrations. He was thus creating a work that could rival lyric compositions, such as Simonides' elegy on the battle of Plataea.⁸¹

instead to 'a nascent expression of the very tension between Panhellenic ideals and Athenian imperial ideology'.

⁷⁵ πρὸς γῇ Πλαταιῶν Δωρίδος λόγχης ὕπο, *Pers.* 817; see Garvie (2009) 314.

⁷⁶ Hdt. 7.166 and Arist. *Poet.* 1459a. Diod. Sic. 11.24.1 places Himera and Themopylae on the same day.

⁷⁷ Diod. Sic. 11.23.1.

⁷⁸ Diod. Sic. 11.20; cf. Σ Pind. Pyth. 1.146 (Drachmann II p. 24).

⁷⁹ Diod. Sic. 11.25.7; Athen. 6. 231e–232c; Σ Pind. Pyth. 1.152b (Drachmann II p. 26).

⁸⁰ London BM 1823, 0610.1.

⁸¹ *POxy.* 2327 and 3965; see Taplin (2006) 4–6.

This work in praise of the Spartan contribution has been seen as a royal commission.⁸²

Something comparable seems to have been happening in Sicily later in the decade. Aeschylus in his *Persians* and Pindar in his Sicilian odes touch on a number of similar themes. In the same ode in which Pindar celebrated the founding of Aetna, he specifically juxtaposes Salamis and Plataea with Cumae, the battle at which Hieron is said to have ‘rescued Greece from grave slavery’ (Ἑλλάδ’ ἐξέλκων βαρείας δουλίας, *Pyth.* 1.75). Freedom from slavery is the dominant motivation for the Greeks of Aeschylus: the Athenian war cry is ‘free the fatherland’ (ἐλευθεροῦτε πατρίδα, *Pers.* 403). Pindar recalls the cult of Zeus of Freedom in connection with the city of Himera (Ζηνὸς Ἐλευθερίου, *Ol.* 12.1). Both sets of barbarian enemies are defeated as a punishment for hybris (*Pind.* *Pyth.* 1.72; *Aesch.* *Pers.* 821).

Simonides, Pindar, and Aeschylus all had broadly similar briefs, but in Sicily Aeschylus and Pindar were working for the Deinomenids. Pindar makes precisely this point in the first *Pythian*. He admits that Hieron is not his only patron. He has travelled widely enough to be rewarded by both the Athenians and the Spartans:

ἀρέομαι
παρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθηναίων χάριν
μισθόν, ἐν Σπάρτῃ δ’ ἄρα τᾶν πρὸ Κιθαιρώωνος μαχᾶν,
ταῖσι Μήδαιοι κάμον ἀγκυλότοξοι

I will receive from Salamis the thanks of the Athenians as a fee, and in Sparta from the battles before Cithaeron, in which were vanquished the Medes with their curved bows

(*Pyth.* 1.75–8).

Pindar presents himself as a praise-poet, moving between Athens and Sparta, taking his pay (μισθόν), in the form of thanks for poems sung in honour of their victories. We know that he had Athenian patrons and composed poetry in praise of that city.⁸³ Like Simonides, he

⁸² See Nobili (2011) 26–7; Schachter (1998) argues that the work was commissioned by Pausanias for a performance before the Greek forces at Sigeum.

⁸³ *Pyth.* 7; *Nem.* 2; paeans: 5 fr. 52e S–M, see Rutherford (2001) 293–8; dithyrambs: fr. 74a–88 S–M; *thrēnoi*: fr. 137 S–M.

probably also visited Sparta. But here he sings a different ode for another group of patrons and for another battle:

παρὰ δὲ τὰν εὐνδρον ἄκτὰν
 Ἰμέρα παίδεσσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένεος τελέσσαις,
 τὸν ἐδέξαντ' ἄμφ' ἄρετῃ, πολέμιων ἀνδρῶν καμόντων.

But by the well-watered bank of the river Himeras [I will receive my fee] having completed a hymn for the sons of Deinomenes, which they received for their valour with the defeat of their enemies.

(78–80)

Pindar not only equates the victories of Hieron and Gelon with the triumphs at Salamis and Plataea, he also alludes to the fact that, in the Panhellenic celebration culture, he is at the service of more than one victorious Greek state. As a poet who is in high demand, he is able to travel the circuit of musical competitions from one part of Greece to another. The same was probably true of Aeschylus.

In Sicily the great Athenian employs what have been termed 'the poetic strategies of wandering poets'.⁸⁴ If the *Persians* contained praise of Athens and Sparta, the other plays in the trilogy may also have alluded to the victory at Himera. At its first performance in Athens, the *Persians* was performed second in a tetralogy, preceded by *Phineus* and followed by *Glaucus of Potniae*, both of which are now lost.⁸⁵ The satyr play *Prometheus*, possibly the play known elsewhere as *Prometheus Fire-Kindler*, rounded off the whole.⁸⁶ Were any of these plays re-performed in Sicily alongside the *Persians*? We have no ancient evidence to show that they were and we cannot automatically assume that trilogies would have been produced at Sicilian festivals. However, there are reasons to suppose that the entire trilogy, and not just the *Persians*, could have been performed in the Greek West.

The works performed with *Persians* do not seem to have been closely linked in terms of their plot, unlike some other Aeschylean

⁸⁴ Martin (2009) 81.

⁸⁵ Another play, *Glaucus Pontios*, could also have been performed in the tetralogy. Most scholars have preferred *Potnieus*, especially since this is the title given in most, though not all, of the manuscripts of the *Persians* hypothesis. See Garvie (2009) xvii and Sommerstein (2012) 96–7.

⁸⁶ ἐπὶ Μένωνος τραγωδῶν Αἰσχύλος ἐνίκα Φινεῖ, Πέρσαις, Γλαύκῳ, Προμηθεῖ, arg. *Pers.* 16–17. *Fire-Kindler* may be the same play as the *Prometheus Fire-Bearer*, sometimes associated with the trilogy of the *Prometheus Bound*; see Brown (1990).

trilogies such as the *Oresteia*. There is no obvious explanation as to why an historical tragedy should have been sandwiched between two works dealing with separate myths. *Phineus* told the story of the seer who was tormented by the Harpies before his rescue by the Argonauts. *Glaucus of Potniae* covered the death of Glaucus at the funeral games of Pelias. The unfortunate hero is killed in a chariot crash and then devoured by his own horses. However, the scholion on Pindar's first *Pythian* quotes a passage, possibly from the *Glaucus of Potniae*, which may provide a clue as to the connection between these plays:

καλοῖσι λουτροῖς †ἐκλέλουμαι† δέμας
εἰς ὑψίκρημνον Ἰμέραν δ' ἀφικόμην.

I have bathed my body with fine waters and arrived at the high crest of Himera.

(Aesch. fr. 25a TrGF).⁸⁷

Someone has bathed at Himera in Sicily. What has Himera to do with Potniae in Boeotia or Iolcus in Thessaly, at which the funeral games of Pelias took place?

Sommerstein has argued that we have here an oblique reference to the battle of Himera. Hamilcar, the Carthaginian general, was killed by the Syracusan cavalry as he was about to sacrifice to Poseidon.⁸⁸ A link could have been made between the fates of Glaucus and Hamilcar, both of which involved horses. And if the speaker of fr. 25a has come from Sicily to Boeotia, he must in all likelihood be a god. Poseidon seems a likely candidate. In the *Eumenides* (397–404) Athena reveals, on entering, that she has been summoned by Orestes' prayer to Athens from the Scamander in the Troad. Was Poseidon called from Himera in a similar way? If so, these lines may belong to the opening of a speech by Poseidon, who could well have predicted the future battle at Himera and his role in securing success for the Greeks.

If this is right, then how does the *Phineus* fit in? The two Argonauts who chased off the Harpies were Zetes and Calais, the sons of the wind god Boreas. Their mother was Oreithyia, the daughter of Erechtheus, the mythical king of Athens. Herodotus (7.189) tells us that the Athenians prayed to Boreas and Oreithyia to destroy the Persian fleet as it was proceeding south along the coast of Greece in the weeks before Salamis. Phineus, a prophet, could easily have

⁸⁷ Assigned to *Glaucus of Potniae* by Sommerstein (2008) 22–4; cf. (2012).

⁸⁸ Diod. Sic. 11.21.4–22.1.

predicted these events in a speech of thanks to his protectors.⁸⁹ Alternatively, the myth of the Argonauts deals with an early Greek expedition into barbarian territory and the theft of a barbarian woman: the origin, according to Herodotus (1.2), of the conflict between Greeks and Persians. The presence of the Argonauts at the funeral Games of Pelias may have been noted in the *Glaucus at Potniae*: if so, the two plays provided a convenient frame for the historical drama of the *Persians*.⁹⁰ Sommerstein thus argues that the trilogy covered all the main events of the Persian War in temporal sequence, though with a special emphasis on the victory at Salamis.⁹¹ The *Phineus* predicted the destruction of the Persian fleet off Cape Sepias. The *Persians* covered the battle at Salamis in detail and predicted the final victory at Plataea. The *Glaucus of Potniae* ended with Poseidon predicting defeat for the Carthaginians at Himera. If Sommerstein is right, a performance of the whole *Persians* trilogy in Sicily remains a possibility.

CONCLUSION

The dissemination and development of the genre of tragedy appear to have taken place simultaneously during the early fifth century. Our earliest extant drama, Aeschylus' *Persians*, was probably re-performed in Sicily in around 470; Pratinas had made his first appearance at the Athenian Dionysia approximately two decades earlier. This dissemination of tragedy needs to be seen in the context of the broader Panhellenic 'song culture'. Aeschylus' move to the Greek West was symptomatic of a longstanding trend that had begun at least a century before his birth and would continue in subsequent generations. He performed alongside, and competed with, the greatest artists of his time from across the Greek world, including Epicharmus of Syracuse, Pindar of Thebes, and Simonides and Bacchylides of Ceos. It is likely that all these poets found themselves in the same place for similar reasons: Sicily offered them a substantial audience, prosperous cities, and rich patrons. The

⁸⁹ Sommerstein (2012) 101–2.

⁹⁰ As argued by Moreau (1992/3) 124, 131–4.

⁹¹ Sommerstein (2012) 102.

surviving works produced for Hieron by Aeschylus and Pindar appear to have had a similar purpose and may have been intended for a similar performance context.

The number of plays staged by Aeschylus (or even his contemporary Phrynichus) and the precise details of the performance context is unknown. What we can say, however, is that two plays staged in Sicily, the *Aetnaeae* and *Persians*, are both notable for attempting to set the action within a Panhellenic—or in the case of the *Aetnaeae* a more narrowly pan-Sicilian—context. It would be a mistake to view either of these works as merely political plays, designed for one audience and one performance. On the contrary, we know that Aeschylus re-produced the *Persians* in Sicily during his own lifetime. The *Aetnaeae* was a play about movement in eastern Sicily and, most probably, the foundation of a local cult. In this sense, and setting aside the unusual staging and content, the play seems to have been fairly typical of tragedy in general throughout the fifth century. The cult of the Palici appears to have provided a new city with an ancient past, and, moreover, one that was shared by other communities in the same region. The *Persians*, on the other hand, celebrated the combined achievements of the Greeks under Athenian and Spartan leadership. The whole trilogy may have gone further in linking the victory of the Greeks in Sicily to the triumph over the Persians in the east. In the one play connections are drawn between communities of one particular region, in the other it is the entirety of the Greek world that is at stake. However disunited the Greeks may have been throughout the actual course of the war, they shared a common desire to celebrate and commemorate the victory. To this end they turned to poets, including, for the first time, poets of tragedy.

Tragedy outside Attica c.450–400 BC

INTRODUCTION

By the time of his death in 456, Aeschylus, like his contemporary and rival Pindar, had developed an international reputation extending beyond the borders of his own city. In the years that followed, Euripides would prove a worthy successor. In this chapter we will consider how tragedy functioned as a Panhellenic genre and what it was that made tragedy in this period an identifiable part of a shared Greek culture.

We will concentrate on three different groups of plays, all by Euripides: *Archelaus*, *Temenus* and *Temenidae*; then *Andromache*; and finally *Captive Melanippe* and *Aeolus*. Like the *Aetnaeae* and *Persians* of Aeschylus, the first two sets of plays were almost certainly performed outside Athens during Euripides' lifetime. *Archelaus*, *Temenus*, and *Temenidae* were very probably commissioned by King Archelaus of Macedon, who ruled from 413 to 399 BC, and who, like Hieron, was one of the great enlightened despots of the ancient world. We are therefore in a position to assess what it was that was Athenian or Greek in these tragedies. Were they Athenian exports transplanted abroad? Or plays specifically tailored for a foreign public? Or works typical of a genre that was Panhellenic in essence? We can be less sure, however, regarding the final two tragedies. They were very probably staged at Athens in the final quarter of the fifth century and no ancient source records a performance outside Attica. Nevertheless, they are included as an interesting case of tragedy's ability to draw links between disparate Greek communities, based on genealogy, shared cult, and myths of travel. In addition, I make a tentative argument for their early dissemination in Italy. Together, the extant texts or fragments of these plays provide us with an image, admittedly incomplete, of tragedy as it was known to non-Athenian audiences.

1. EURIPIDES' *ARCHELAUS*, *TEMENUS*,
AND *TEMENIDAE*

a. The Myth and its Purpose

The subject of these three plays forms part of a major and, by the fifth century, well established myth of migration: that of the Heraclidae. Such stories of travel, as we have seen, work to connect multiple and often geographically disparate cities through a shared Panhellenic ancestor, in this case Heracles. Though only a few cities, such as Argos and Thebes, could claim Heracles as a former resident, other communities purported to be descended from the same blood line, thanks to the myth of the Dorian migration. Three Heraclids—Temenus, Cresphontes, and Aristodemus—were held to have settled branches of the Dorian race in Argos, Messenia, and Laconia respectively.¹ In doing so, they expelled the Achaeans led by Tisamenus, the son of Orestes, and, following the victory, they divided the Peloponnese between them by casting lots.²

This indirect link to the great hero was cultivated by the Spartans from at least the seventh century.³ As Tyrtaeus related (fr. 2.14 West), the Heraclid settlers of Sparta had returned to the Peloponnese from Erineus, in central Greece, one of the cities that, overlooked by the Pindus mountains, collectively formed the region of Doris. By the fifth century, Dorian and Heraclid ancestry was still central to Spartan identity and could even affect Spartan policy. In 457, Sparta sent an expedition to protect Doris and Erineus from invasion by the Phocians; we may infer that this was at least partly because of their ancestral links with what Thucydides termed the 'original homeland of the Lacedaemonians' (τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων μητρόπολιν, 1.107.2). Yet Laconia was only one region occupied by the Heraclidae. As Herodotus (8.43) observed, with the single exception of Hermione all of the Peloponnesian states who contributed ships to the Greek fleet in 480 traced their descent from the same Dorian migration. The travels of Temenus, Cresphontes, and Aristodemus provided a shared identity to all members of the Dorian race and, through Heracles, a place in the broader Panhellenic mythical tradition.

¹ Pl. *Leg.* 683c-d; Isoc. 6. 16-21; Paus. 2.18.6-7; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.8.2-5.

² Lots: see Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 115; Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.8.2-5; Paus. 2.18.6-8; 4.3.3-5.

³ Tyrtaeus frs. 2.12-15, 11.1-2 West; Isoc. 6. 16-22; see Nilsson (1951) 71-2.

The cities of Heracles' descendants were not even confined to the Peloponnese. The Cyrenaeans in North Africa traced their origins both to the Lemnian sons of the Argonauts and to the Laconian settlers of Thera: a mythical pedigree celebrated by Pindar in his Pythian odes for the tyrant Arcesilaus.⁴ Apollo, the god equally of the Cyrenaean and Spartan Carnea, is said to have established through his oracle both the migration of the Dorians and the tripartite division of the Peloponnese among the Heraclidae:

τῷ [καὶ] Λακεδαίμονι
ἐν Ἀργεὶ τε καὶ ζαθέῃ Πύλῳ
ἔνασσαν ἀλκάντας Ἡρακλέος
ἐκγόνους Αἰγυμιοῦ τε.

With this he settled in Lacedaimon and in Argos and in sacred Pylos the mighty descendants of Heracles and Aegimius.

(Pyth. 5.69–72)

Theras, the regent of the sons of Aristodemus, departed for Thera once his charges were old enough to claim their birthright; thence came Battus, the founder of Arcesilaus' line.⁵

Pindar similarly alludes to the myth of the Heraclidae in order to celebrate the Dorian identity of Hieron's foundation of Aetna:

ἄγ' ἔπειτ' Αἴτνας βασιλεῖ φίλιον ἐξεύρωμεν ὕμνον·
τῷ πόλιν κείναν θεοδμάτῳ σὺν ἐλευθερία
Υἱλίδος στάθμας Ἰέρων ἐν νόμοις ἔ-
κτισσε· θέλοντι δὲ Παμφύλου
καὶ μὰν Ἡρακλειδᾶν ἔκγονοι
ὄχθαις ὕπο Ταῦγέτου ναῖοντες αἰ-
εὶ μένειν τεθμοῖσιν ἐν Αἰγυμιοῦ
Δωριεῖς. ἔσχον δ' Ἀμύκλας ὄλβιοι
Πινδόθεν ὀρνύμενοι, λευκοπόων
Τυνδαριδᾶν βαθύδοξοι
γείτονες, ὧν κλέος ἄνθησεν αἰχμᾶς.

But come let us find a hymn of love for the king of Aetna, for whom Hieron established that city with divinely wrought freedom under the laws of the rule of Hyllus. It is the wish of the descendants of Pamphylus and indeed of the Heraclidae, dwelling under the slopes Taygetus, to remain always under the

⁴ Pyth. 5.74–81; cf. the double origin is alluded to in Pyth. 4.42–9.

⁵ κείνος ὄρνις ἐκτελευτάσει μεγάλαν πόλιν ματρώπολιν Θήραν γενέσθαι, Pyth. 4.19–20; Theras: Hdt. 4.146–7; note the divergent traditions of Battus' origins Hdt. 4.154–5.

ordinances of Aegimius as Dorians. Having set out from Pindus, with good fortune they took Amyclae as the highly famed neighbours of the Tyndaridae, they of the white horses, and their renown as spearmen has blossomed.

(*Pyth.* 1.60–66)

Here Pindar provides the inhabitants of the new city, both Peloponnesian settlers and native Dorian Sicilians, with their full mythical pedigree. He follows the Spartan tradition of the Dorian migration from the region of the Pindus. A new foundation on the periphery of the Greek world is thus linked back to Sparta ‘under the slopes Taygetus’, an ancient city at the very centre. Moreover, as in the fifth *Pythian* for Arcesilaus, Pindar is careful to combine the ethnic origins of the Dorian race with the more generally Panhellenic hero Heracles. Aetna’s laws are thus both those of Hyllus, the son of Heracles, and of Aegimius the son of Dorus, who is said to have adopted Hyllus as his heir alongside his natural progeny Pamphilus and Dyman.⁶ Pindar thus appeals to two complementary and overlapping identities: as Greek descendants of Heracles and as specifically Dorian Greeks.

As we have seen, in Sicily Aeschylus did not merely share a patron with Pindar in the person of Hieron: like Pindar, he attempted to present the achievements of the Deinomenids as of both pan-Sicilian and Panhellenic importance. In the second half of the fifth century, Euripides would prove as skilful in his employment of myths of travel, and specifically that of the Heraclidae. The tragedies *Archelaus*, *Temenus*, and *Temenidae* concerned the Dorian migration and its aftermath. However, like Pindar’s *Pythian* odes, they celebrate not the establishment of the Peloponnesian kingdoms but a subsequent foundation: the Macedonian royal house.

The prologue of the *Archelaus* survives and is delivered by the eponymous hero. His father, we learn, was Temenus, which makes Archelaus part of the Argive branch of the Heraclid line and the direct descendant of Hyllus (the founder of the Heraclid branch of the Dorian race), Heracles and his forebears, going back to Danaus and his brother Aegyptus.⁷ Hyginus is the only source to provide any

⁶ Cf. Hes. fr. 10a.6–7 M–W, where Aegimius and his sons are established as descendants of Aeolus through Dorus. On Aegimius’ adoption of Hyllus see Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 15 and 18b; Strabo 9.4.10.

⁷ See Eur. frs. 228 and 228a; Harder (1985) 148–56; Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004) 351–3. An alternative prologue (fr. 846), beginning with Aegyptus, is cited by Aristophanes (*Ran.* 1204–6); see section 5.1.b.

further information on the mythical Archelaus, and his account may be closely based on Euripides' play.⁸ As in the surviving fragments, Hyginus' Archelaus is a son of Temenus, who is exiled from Argos by his brothers and undertakes to work as a mercenary for a Thracian king called Cisseus.⁹ In one fragment of the play (fr. 229) the king is also given the name Cisseus, while in another this ruler appears to be interested in hiring the services of a descendent of Heracles:

ἡμῶν τί δῆτα τυγχάνεις χρεῖαν ἔχων;
πατέρων γὰρ ἐσθλῶν ἐλπίδας δίδως γεγώς.

(Archelaus?) Why then do you happen to have need of me?

(Cisseus?) You were born of noble fathers and thus give me cause for hope.

(fr. 231 *TrGF*)

Cisseus attempts to cheat Archelaus of his promised reward, the hand of his daughter in marriage, and lays a trap for the hero in the form of a fiery pit. Archelaus, however, is informed of his employer's treachery in time and casts the king into the very pit intended for him. Hyginus concludes his narrative with the events immediately following the king's death:

inde profugit ex responso Apollinis in Macedoniam capra duce, oppidumque ex nomine caprae Aegeas constituit.

From there he fled with a goat as his guide on the basis of an oracular response of Apollo, and founded the town of Aegae after the word for goat.

(*Fab.* 219)

This looks distinctly like a *deus ex machina* prophecy for the foundation of the Macedonian royal line at Aegae, a type of scene regularly employed by Euripides at the conclusion of his dramas.¹⁰

⁸ Harder (1985) 131–9, 170; Di Gregorio (1988) 37–8, Katsouris (2005) 210–11, and Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 110 treat Hyginus' account as essentially a retelling of the *Archelaus*' plot. Huys (1997) 11–30 has urged caution on the use of Hyginus for the reconstruction of Euripides' plays, including the *Archelaus* ('num recte' in the opinion of Kannicht *TrGF* V/1 p. 314). However, in this case it is likely that Euripides was Hyginus' only source as he shows no awareness of the alternative myths surrounding the Temenidae and, most importantly, uses the name Archelaus which is found in no other source. In addition, unlike many other entries, *Fab.* 219 covers only one event (Cisseus' death and its causes), which could easily take place within the action of one play.

⁹ *Archelaus Temeni filius exsul a fratribus eiectus in Thraciam ad regem Cisseum venit*, *Fab.* 219; on the conjecture *in Thraciam* see Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004) 353–4.

¹⁰ See Harder (1985) 174; Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 121.

It is harder to be certain regarding the content of the other two plays, *Temenus* and *Temenidae*, though in both cases the action appears to belong to an earlier period, either during or shortly after the conquest of the Peloponnese. A number of papyrus fragments have survived from the hypotheses of both plays.¹¹ Unfortunately we do not know which fragments fit with which play, with the sole exception of fr. 8 which consists only of the title and first line of *Temenus*. However, two fragments (*P.Oxy.* 2455 frs. 9 and 10) concern the division of Argos, Messenia, and Sparta among the victorious Heraclidae. These two fragments cannot belong to the hypothesis of the same play and therefore both dramas must to some extent have dealt with the conquest of the Peloponnese and its settlement. Descriptions of Laconia and Messenia, attributed by Strabo to Euripides, further confirm that the casting of lots for different kingdoms either preceded or was part of the action of these plays.¹²

Because of the prominence of *Temenus* in fr. 10, Harder argued that it came from the hypothesis of the play *Temenus*.¹³ The other, fr. 9, deals with the division in a much more cursory manner.¹⁴ While fr. 10 covered the division in at least six lines or more, fr. 9 takes only twelve lines to cover several events. This includes the selection of a certain Oxylyus as the guide of the Heraclidae on the basis of an interpretation of an oracle by *Temenus*. Here *Temenus* is again one of the protagonists and seems to have played an important role in choosing Oxylyus as their guide. However, while he may have been the leader of the division in fr. 10 (*Τήμενος μερ*[, fr. 10.129), in this fragment the role is taken by Oxylyus. The name Archelaus is preserved in the final line of fr. 9. Harder joined fr. 9 to fr. 107 and *P. Mich.* 1319: two overlapping fragments involving the battle to win control of the Peloponnese.¹⁵ Here again we find that Archelaus is named. *Temenus*, presumably now that he has laid claim to Argos through the casting of lots, promises to make the son who fights best his heir. After the battle, Archelaus, his oldest son, is chosen. Here the papyrus breaks off. This play may have gone on to explain how Archelaus was exiled, possibly through the envy of his brothers. This probably comprised the action of the *Temenidae*.¹⁶

¹¹ *P.Oxy.* 2455 frs. 8–11 and 107 = *P. Mich.* 1319. See Harder (1979) and (1991).

¹² Fr. 727e = Strabo 8.5.6.

¹³ Harder (1991) 123–4.

¹⁴ Harder (1991) 120–1.

¹⁵ See Harder (1979).

¹⁶ This division of the fragments between the two hypotheses has also been adopted by Kannicht *TrGF* V/2 p. 719. On the possibility of two plays entitled *Temenidae* see Luppe (1992) 98.

These plays largely follow the canonical foundation myth established by the Macedonian kings from as early as the start of the fifth century. Herodotus (8.139) gives the names of six kings before Alexander I and, like Euripides, asserts that these were of the line of Temenus. Thucydides (2.99.3; 5.80.2) also confirms that by the late fifth century the Macedonians were viewed as Heraclid descendants of Temenus. However, in Herodotus' account it is not Archelaus but Perdiccas who is the descendant of Temenus and the first Macedonian king.¹⁷ As in Euripides' and Hyginus' version, he is an exile from Argos and the servant of a local king. According to Herodotus, Perdiccas looked after the smaller livestock (perhaps a reference to the goat of the oracle) while his brothers tended the cows and horses.¹⁸ As in the case of Archelaus, Perdiccas and his brothers are defrauded of their pay.

This tradition dates at least from at least the reign of Alexander I (498–452), who cited the myth specifically in order to prove his Argive descent and consequent status as 'a Greek man and ruler of the Macedonians' (*ἀνὴρ Ἕλληνα, Μακεδόνων ὑπαρχος*, Hdt. 5.20.4). He did this in order to qualify for the games at Olympia.¹⁹ Alexander also was the first Macedonian king to mint coins and among his designs was a goat.²⁰ Possibly in emulation of his ancestor, whose fame he was so keen to propagate, he named his son Perdiccas. When Perdiccas' son Archelaus came to the throne he continued the Hellenizing agenda of his grandfather, with both the Heracles and the goat motif reappearing on the coinage. Although Alexander may have appeared to have settled the question of Macedonian origins, subsequent rulers continued to justify their status as Greeks, through Heracles and Hellen, the eponymous ancestor of the Hellenic race.²¹ Their opponents were equally willing to treat the Macedonians as non-Greeks when it suited their interests. Thrasy-machus of Chalcedon, in a polemic against Macedonia, claimed that the barbarian Archelaus had enslaved the Greeks of Larissa.²²

¹⁷ Hdt 8. 139: *γενέτωρ Περδίκκης ἐστὶ ὁ κτησάμενος τῶν Μακεδόνων τὴν τυραννίδα*; cf. 5.22.1 *Ἕλληνας δὲ εἶναι τούτους τοὺς ἀπὸ Περδίκκew γεγῶτας*.

¹⁸ Hdt. 8.137; Harder (1985) 135.

¹⁹ Herodotus 5.22.2; on Alexander and the myth, see Borza, (1982) 7–13; Hammond and Griffith, (1979) 3–13.

²⁰ Hammond and Griffith (1979) 99–100, 138.

²¹ See J.M. Hall (2001) 156–86. Hellen: [Hesiod] fr. 2 and 3 M–W.

²² *Ἀρχελάω δουλεύουσιν Ἕλληνες ὄντες βαρβάρω*, D–K 85 F 2.

Demosthenes would use the same rhetoric against Philip half a century later.²³

Although Euripides appears to have dramatized the established Macedonian foundation myth, he changed one crucial detail: the name of the protagonist. The hero Archelaus is otherwise completely absent from the earlier mythical tradition and makes no appearance whatever in later royal genealogies. This is despite the fact that Alexander the Great and his successors continued to trace their descent from Temenus and Perdiccas.²⁴ One significant change reported by Diodorus (relying in part on the fourth-century historian Theopompus) is the introduction of an entirely new Macedonian founder: a certain Caranus, whom Satyrus makes the great-grandfather of Perdiccas and the distant descendant of Temenus.²⁵ This name may derive from another word for goat and, in general, Diodorus' sources appear to have amalgamated a number of traditional stories concerning the early history of Macedonia.²⁶

²³ 3.16, 9.31, 19.305 and 308.

²⁴ Diod. Sic. 7.16; 'Satyrus' F 28.1.20–1 (Schorn p. 129) = *P.Oxy* 2465 fr. 1, col. 2. 20–1; 'Satyrus' F 29.9 (Schorn p. 136) = *FGrHist* 631 F 1; see Stephanie West (1974) 284–5, Hammond and Griffith (1979) 13, Bosworth (1996) 155. *SEG* XXXVIII 1476, 40–2, an inscription from Xanthos dated to 206/5 BC, reiterates the Ptolemies' claim to Heraclid descent. On the Seleucid claim to Temenid ancestry see Libanius *Or.* 11.91. The author of a treatise on the demes of Alexandria names a certain Ceisus as the son of Temenus and an ancestor of both Perdiccas and Caranus (Satyros *FGrHist* 631 F 1.7 = F 28.1.15 and 29.7 Schorn pp. 129 and 136). Elsewhere, however, Ceisus seems to be unconnected with Macedonia and appears only in the context of the history of the Peloponnese (see Paus. 2.19.1, 28.3–7). The only exceptions of sources that trace the Macedonian line from Archelaus are Hyg. *Fab.* 219, which may well be entirely derived from Euripides' play, and Dio Chrys. 4.70–2, which is also probably influenced by Euripides: see Harder (1985) 170 and 175–6. The only other possibilities are a son of Temenus named Agelaus (Apollodorus 2.8.5) or Agraius (Nicolaus *FGrHist* 90 F 30; Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 F 18b–c; Paus. 2.28.3) but he is never connected with Macedonia. Rusten (1980) 42 suggests that the name Agelaus in the text of Apollodorus may have come about from the confusion of the names Agraius and Archelaus. All of these figures appear to be distinct from the early tradition of the eponymous hero Macedon (Hes. fr. 7 M–W).

²⁵ Diod. Sic. 7.17; Theopompus: *FGrHist* 115 F 393; cf. Satyrus F 28 and F 29 (Schorn pp. 129–38); see Jacoby's commentary pp. 400–2; Schorn pp. 447, 451. Greenwalt (1985) dates this change to the early fourth century during the reigns of either Amyntas II or Amyntas III.

²⁶ Hesych. κ 768; see Hammond and Griffith (1979) 12. Schorn p. 451 understands Caranus to be a term for ruler following Xen. *Hell.* 1.4.3. In the Caranus legend, the hero is not merely a hired labourer but is summoned, as in Euripides, as a mercenary to aid the king against his enemies with the promise of part of his kingdom (Eusebius *Chron.* I p. 227 Schöne = Diod. Sic. 7.15.1).

The change in the name of the Macedonian founding hero may have been intended to confirm the legitimacy of Archelaus' rule. The Macedonian kings justified their power over the domestic population by pointing to the benefits their ancestors had brought their people in establishing a homeland for the Macedonians (Arist. *Pol.* 1310b39–40). As a result, they laid claim to the title of kings and avoided the unpleasant term 'tyrant'.²⁷ Archelaus may have had need of such arguments. He was a bastard child of king Perdiccas and only came to the throne by murdering a number of his family members after his father's death. In Plato's *Gorgias* (470d–471d), Polus mentions Archelaus as an example of a man who has committed injustices and profited from his crimes. As Plato knew, however, Polus was ultimately mistaken: Archelaus was himself murdered in 399.²⁸ Aristotle (*Pol.* 1311b) mentions the death of Archelaus in a section concerning acts of regicide that were carried out in revenge for *hybris*, another typical feature of tyrannical behaviour alongside the murder of family members.²⁹ Yet like the Pisistratids and Periander before him, in his role as Euripides' patron Archelaus would also be remembered as a cultured and benevolent ruler.

Two conclusions can be drawn at this point. The first is that the decision to name the Macedonian founding hero Archelaus was an innovation that can only have been designed to flatter or appeal to the historical King Archelaus of Macedon. It seems far too convenient that during the reign of Perdiccas the Macedonian founder should be Perdiccas and that during the reign of Archelaus that same founder

²⁷ Rulers known to have avoided the title of tyrant include Pisistratus and his sons, who preserved the earlier constitution unchanged: see Thucydides 6.54.6; [Arist.] *Ath. Pol.* 14.3, 16.1–2; Cawkwell (1995) 76–8. Dionysius of Syracuse may have kept the title General Plenipotentiary (*στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ*) throughout his reign (see Berve (1967) I. 236–9). The word tyrant probably had entirely negative connotations by the late fifth century, at least in Athens. See e.g. Hdt. 5.92; Thuc. 6.53; Pl. *Resp.* 562a–592b; Arist. *Pol.* 1289b; Raafaub (2003). For the possible distinction between the negative use of the word in the classical period and a more neutral sense in the archaic, see Parker (1998) and Anderson (2005).

²⁸ Arist. *Pol.* 1311b; [Pl.] *Alc.* II 141d5–e3.

²⁹ The association of the tyrant with *hybris* and injustice is frequently made in tragedy and was even noted by the tyrant Dionysius I in his plays: see *TrGF* fr. 4 = Plut. *de fortuna Alex.* 338b; cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 534; Soph. *OT* 872; Eur. fr. 437 *TrGF*; Seaford (2003) 98. The pseudo-Platonic dialogues *Theages* (124d) and *Alcibiades II* (141d) go further, explicitly calling Archelaus a tyrant. Archelaus, it would seem, though styled king of the Macedonians, lived and died like any other tyrant.

should be called Archelaus. The hero Archelaus appears as a character in not only the play *Archelaus* but also in at least one of the plays entitled *Temenus* and *Temenidae*. It is reasonable, therefore, to associate all three works with Macedonia, merely on the basis of the few known facts regarding their content.

Second, Euripides dramatized an established foundation myth, the express purpose of which was to demonstrate the right of the Macedonians to be considered Greeks. The sudden change in the name of the Macedonian founder was merely part of Archelaus' personal attempt to associate himself more closely with his traditional Greek Heraclid ancestor, perhaps in order to shore up the legitimacy of his regime. Although the Hellenic identity of the Macedonians was an unusually controversial subject, Euripides was doing little that was radical or new. The myth of the return of the Heraclidae explained how part of the Hellenic race, the Dorians, had come to be scattered across the Mediterranean and enabled Dorian Greeks to lay claim to their place in the broader Hellenic community. Euripides' 'Macedonian' plays aim to incorporate the tales of a distinct community into a common and explicitly Hellenic narrative. This, as we have seen, was a feature of the genre as a whole: tragedy told the old story of the Greek peoples in a new way, with new possibilities.

b. Possibilities for Performance

A number of questions remain unanswered, however. In particular, what can we learn regarding the circumstances of these plays' first performances? We may wish to know whether Euripides produced these plays in Macedonia. If he did, when did this happen? What role did Euripides play at the court of the Macedonian king and what were his motives for travelling north? Unfortunately, our main sources on this subject, the biographies of Euripides, date in the main from the Hellenistic period or later, while the information they contain is in many cases distinctly dubious. In recent decades doubts have been raised over whether the content of these texts can be regarded as in any way factually accurate.³⁰ It is now evident that the biographies of

³⁰ See Fairweather (1974); Lefkowitz (1978) = (1991) 111–26, (1979), (2012) 98–9 Scullion (2003). For the testimonia see *TrGF* V/1 pp. 45–56. The *Life of Aeschylus* has suffered slightly less. See Scullion (2003) 393, who is sceptical of the *Vita's* account of the death of Euripides, but accepts as a fact that Aeschylus died in Sicily. Kivilo (2010)

Euripides conform to a common idea of the travelling poet that had been firmly established in the Greek imagination from as early as the archaic period. He appears both as an exiled scapegoat driven from his homeland and as a wandering poet honoured and rewarded in the cities through which he travels. Ancient authors appear to have adapted and even perhaps invented details to suit the overriding pattern. This serves further to demonstrate the importance of the idea of the wandering poet in Greek culture; yet it also means that we should be wary of accepting specific details as historical facts.

Euripides' journey to Macedonia and his relationship with King Archelaus form a major part of the *Vita* tradition. In the dialogue on Euripides' life by Satyrus, which may date to the third century BC, we hear that Euripides' departure was a permanent and voluntary exile, prompted by resentment at his poor reception by the Athenian public.³¹ The special honour in which he was held by Archelaus is contrasted with his generally unfavourable treatment in Athens.³² The biographical essay attributed to Thomas Magister contains a similar story, in which Euripides is unable to bear the abuse of the comic poets following the revelation that he had been cuckolded by his wife.³³

The story of the Macedonian visit is closely connected to the account of Euripides' death and burial away from his homeland: a lasting reproach to the Athenians for offending so great a poet.³⁴ The biographers relate that the unfortunate old man was torn apart by dogs.³⁵ It is assumed that the *Archelaus* was produced at some point between the start of this exile and his death:

ἐκεῖθεν δὲ εἰς Μακεδονίαν παρὰ Ἀρχέλαον γενόμενος διέτριψε καὶ χαριζόμενος αὐτῷ δρᾶμα ὁμωνύμως ἔγραψε . . .

1–6 has argued that later biographical sources may preserve earlier traditions that, in some cases, may date from the poets' lifetimes.

³¹ προσοχθίσας τῷ ἐπιχωρίῳ φθόνῳ τῶν πολιτῶν, Satyrus F 6 (p.106 Schorn) = P.Oxy. 1176 fr. 39, col. 15.

³² μετελθὼν δ' οὖν κατεγήρασε ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ μαλ' ἐντίμως ἀγόμενος παρὰ τῷ δυνάστῃ τὰ τε λοιπά, Satyrus F 6 (p. 108 Schorn) = P.Oxy. 1176 fr. 39, col. 18.

³³ φωράσας δὲ τὸν αὐτοῦ ὑποκριτὴν Κηφισοφῶντα ἐπὶ τῇ γυναικὶ καὶ τὴν ἐντεῦθεν οὐ φέρων αἰσχύνῃ, σκωπτόμενος ὑπὸ τῶν κωμωδοποιῶν, ἀφείς τὴν Ἀθήνησι διατριβὴν εἰς Μακεδονίαν ἀπῆρε παρὰ τὸν βασιλέα Ἀρχέλαον, Vit. Eur. 4.24–9 TrGF.

³⁴ Vit. Eur. Ia. 10 TrGF; Satyrus F 6 (p. 109 Schorn) = P.Oxy. 1176 fr. 39, col. 19. 1; Plut. Lyc. 31.3.

³⁵ Vit. Eur. Ib.3, II.2, III.4, IV.30–3 TrGF.

From there [Magnesia] he came to Macedonia and stayed at the court of Archelaus and to please him wrote a drama of the same name as the king . . .

(Vit. Eur. Ia.6 TrGF).

No mention is made of the *Temenus* or *Temenidae*. The language here recalls that of the Aeschylean *Vita*. The phrase ‘pleasing him’ (χαριζόμενος αὐτῷ) suggests that the relationship between the two men was characterized by an exchange of ‘favour’ (χάρις), similar to that between a guest and host.³⁶ According to this narrative, the relationship of Euripides and Archelaus, like that of Hieron and Aeschylus, is founded on the reciprocal exchange of poetry and praise for hospitality and patronage.

While Euripides’ anger with the Athenians is given in the biographies as one possible explanation for the move to Macedonia, other sources suggest, sometimes explicitly, that the quest for patronage was also a factor. Plato claimed that tragic poets praise tyrants to solicit honour and pay.³⁷ He mentions Euripides in connection with this statement, on account of the poet’s maxim that tyrants become wise from associating with the wise (*Resp.* 568a8–b3; cf. *Soph. fr.* 14 TrGF). In the fictitious letters of Euripides, Archelaus is keen to act as the poet’s patron in return for tragedies, although Euripides professes an unwillingness to accept such offers:

ἔμοιγε μισθὸν οὐκ ἀηδὴ μὲν οὖν οὐδὲ ἄπονον δοκεῖ Ἀρχέλαος ἀναπράσσειν τῶν τε δωρεῶν, ὧν ἔδωκέ μοι εὐθέως ἀφικομένῳ, καὶ ὅτι εἰστία με λαμπρότερον ἢ ἔμοι φίλον ἐκάστης ἡμέρας.

Archelaus seems to be calling in a debt, which is not disagreeable but neither is it without toil on my part, in return for the gifts he gave me on my arrival and because every day he treats me to a feast more splendid than I might wish.

([Eur.] *Epist.* 5.1)³⁸

In many of the other anecdotes concerning Euripides in Macedonia, the poet also dines as a guest with Archelaus.³⁹ The coyness of

³⁶ Hanink (2010a) 59–61.

³⁷ οὐκοῦν καὶ προσέτι τούτων μισθοὺς λαμβάνουσι καὶ τιμῶνται, μάλιστα μὲν, ὥσπερ τὸ εἰκός, ὑπὸ τυράννων, δεύτερον δὲ ὑπὸ δημοκρατίας. *Resp.* 568c7–9.

³⁸ For the text see Gösswein (1975) 68–79 and Kovacs (1994) 128–41. Gösswein (1975) 9–30 dates the letters to the first or second centuries AD.

³⁹ nocte ab eius [sc. Archelaus] cena canibus a quodam aemulo inmissis dilaceratus est, Gellius NA 15.20.9; τοῦ δ’ Εὐριπίδου τὸν καλὸν Ἀγάθωνα περιλαμβάνοντος ἐν τῷ συμποσίῳ, Plut. *reg. et imp. apoth.* 177a.

Euripides in accepting these rewards is equally common and seems to be part of an attempt to rebut any suggestion that the great man could be considered a mercenary flatterer.⁴⁰ Yet these anecdotes also stress that Euripides is worthy of rewards because they are given in exchange for his talents and labour. According to Plutarch (*reg. et imp. apoth.* 177a), Archelaus gave Euripides a gold cup even though it was not he but a less deserving courtier who had asked for it.

The most basic elements of this biographical tradition—that Euripides visited Macedonia and that he composed *Archelaus* for the Macedonian king—seem to be reliable. At the very least the authors of the *Vitae* had the evidence of the title and content of *Archelaus*.⁴¹ The tradition of Euripides' visit to Macedonia is corroborated by fourth-century sources. Aristotle, who knew Macedonia well and whose father was a court physician at Pella, provides an anecdote concerning Euripides' stay at the court of Archelaus, where his behaviour provoked one Macedonian to assassinate the king.⁴² Dicaearchus was similarly aware of the Macedonian visit and claimed that the lines of Euripides fr. 969 *TrGF* were delivered to Archelaus.⁴³ Plato's claim (*Resp.* 568a–d) that tragic poets, including Euripides, liked to praise tyrants and frequent their courts may reflect this same tradition. Hermesianax (fr. 7.65–8 Powell) similarly testifies to the popularity of stories featuring Euripides and Archelaus at the end of the fourth century.

In addition, it seems probable that Archelaus, like Hieron before him, was intent on gathering to his court the great poets and thinkers

⁴⁰ Εὐριπίδης μὲν γὰρ ὅτι Ἀρχελάῳ μέχρη μὲν τοῦ θανάτου παρεσίτει, Lucian *de parasito* 35. On the view of Euripides presented in the *Letters*, see Hanink (2010b) 542–3.

⁴¹ Lefkowitz in her first edition of *The Lives of the Greek Poets* pp. 103–4 suggested that Macedonian localization in the *Bacchae* 409 and 565 may have similarly encouraged Euripides' biographers in their belief in a Macedonian exile. However, as Scullion (2003) 389 n. 2 notes, 'this argument is founded on general scepticism rather than detailed argument'. In addition, Lefkowitz's argument relied in part on the belief that the report of *Bacchae*'s posthumous performance in the scholion on the *Frogs* (Σ *Ran.* 67d Holwerda III 1a p.14) derived from the biographical tradition, whereas in fact its source was probably the more reliable *Didascalidae*.

⁴² Arist. *Pol.* 1311b30–4. Scullion (2003) 396 is correct to doubt the historicity of this anecdote: Euripides was long dead by the time of Archelaus' assassination and hardly in a position to affect court politics at Aegae or Pella. However, this story does at least indicate that a tradition surrounding Euripides' visit to Macedonia was well established around half a century after Euripides' death, if not earlier.

⁴³ Fr. 77 Wehrli = Plut. *de E. ap. Delph.* 384d.

of the age. He is said to have founded the festival of the Olympia at Dion, which certainly involved theatrical contests by the fourth century.⁴⁴ With this festival, Archelaus may have wished to establish Macedonia as a potential destination for wandering poets. If Archelaus was intent on founding a tragic contest at Dion, he would have needed at least two poets, and Euripides is not the only tragedian who is said to have enjoyed the king's hospitality. Aristophanes, in the *Frogs* (83–5), indicates that the tragedian Agathon had left Athens for an extended stay by 405. At the start of Plato's *Symposium* (172c4–5), Agathon has also been abroad for some time. The action of the dialogue is ostensibly narrated before Socrates' death, again indicating that Agathon was away from Athens for several years in the last decade of the fifth century. Where did he go? Later sources confirm that Agathon did indeed stay in Macedonia, although unfortunately we do not know anything about the plays he produced there.⁴⁵ A wide range of other intellectuals are said to have received similar offers. Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1398a 24–7) claims that Socrates was invited to Archelaus' court but that he refused. Later sources provide an extensive list of other visitors to Macedonia, including the lyric poets Melanippides of Melos and Timotheus of Miletus, the epic poet Choerilus of Samos, and the painter Zeuxis.⁴⁶ These performers conform to the well-established type of the travelling poet, moving between festivals and the houses of wealthy patrons.

Yet beyond the fact of Euripides' visit to Macedonia, and the probability that *Archelaus*, *Temenus*, and *Temenidae* were intended for performance in a festival contest, perhaps at Dion, do we have any reliable information? The most pertinent detail provided by the biographies is that *Archelaus* dates to the end of Euripides' life, after his final departure from Athens. His stay in Macedonia has therefore been dated to the period between the production of *Orestes*—the last

⁴⁴ σκηνηκούς ἀγῶνας Diod. Sic. 17.16.4; Arr. 1.11.1; Σ Dem. 19.401.13; see Hammond and Griffith (1979) 150–1; Hatzopoulos (1996) I 289 n.7. A late fourth-century inscription from Dion concerns the award of *prohedria* at the Dionysia: see Hatzopoulos (1996) II no. 57 pp. 73–4. A performance at Aegae should, however, not be ruled out: see Ridgeway (1926) 6; Sourvinou-Inwood (2003) 41–4.

⁴⁵ Σ Ar. *Ran.* 85a–b (Holwerda III 1a p.17); Σ Pl. *Symp.* 172a = Marsyas of Philippi *FGrHist* 135 F 8; Ael. *VH* 2.21.

⁴⁶ Melanippides was in Macedonia in the reign of Perdiccas according to the *Suda* μ 454; on Timotheus, see Ch. 3.2.a; on Choerilus, see Athen. 345d; on Zeuxis, Ael. *VH* 14.17.

play certainly staged at the Athenian Dionysia—in the spring of 408 and Euripides' death in 407/6.⁴⁷ However, two elements central to the story of Euripides' Macedonian travels—his exile and death outside of Athens—have been called into question. As Stevens demonstrated more than half a century ago, there is little evidence to suggest that Euripides was driven out of Athens by an unappreciative public.⁴⁸ Rather the expulsion of the despised scapegoat is a topos of ancient biography.⁴⁹ The stories of Euripides' unpopularity were almost certainly derived from comedy. Although Euripides was awarded relatively few victories, he was regularly granted a chorus by the archon: an important measure of success in itself.⁵⁰ The frequent jokes made at Euripides' expense in comedy paradoxically suggest that he was popular enough to merit such interest.

If Euripides did not go into exile in Macedonia, he may have intended to return to Athens following the production of his plays in Dion or elsewhere. We may wonder whether the biographers were guilty of compressing stories of Euripides' travels into the final period of his life in order to sustain the notion of rejection from Athens. In much the same way, Aeschylus' various journeys to Sicily were simplified into one 'exile' at the end of his life. He also was said to have left Athens in anger. The Euripides *Vita* mentions Magnesia as another destination visited by Euripides and notes that he was granted *proxenia* by the Magnesians.⁵¹ This award at least indicates that the Magnesians expected Euripides to return to Athens in order to be *proxenos* there.⁵² From what we can tell, this story does not seem to be derived from comedy or Euripides' own works and (unlike much of the tradition) seems far from implausible.⁵³ One parallel case

⁴⁷ See Zielinski (1922) 325–6; Webster (1967) 238; Harder (1985) 125; Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 337; Katsouris (2005) 205; Vahtikari (2014) 87.

⁴⁸ Stevens (1956); cf. Lefkowitz (1979) 209; (2012) 74, 91 Scullion (2003) 389–90.

⁴⁹ Compton (2006) 138–9; Hanink (2010a) 49–51; Lefkowitz (2012) 3.

⁵⁰ Wright (2009) 170.

⁵¹ μετέστη δὲ ἐν Μαγνησίᾳ καὶ προξενία ἐτιμήθη καὶ ἀτελείᾳ, *Vit. Eur.* Ia. 6 TrGF.

⁵² Stevens (1956) 90–1; Niesler (1981) 208 notes that Euripides probably never had time to take up the role of *proxenos* and this may indicate a new form of purely honorary *proxenia*. However, it is more than likely that the Magnesians assumed that Euripides would return to Athens and intended for Euripides to act as their *proxenos* in the usual sense.

⁵³ See Lefkowitz (1979) 197–8. Lesky (1963) 398 believed that the story derived from an honorary inscription; cf. Niesler (1981) 207–8; Easterling (1994) 76.

is Pindar, whom the Athenians made their *proxenos*, allegedly as a reward for a poem in praise of their city.⁵⁴

Scullion has gone further and questioned the entire story of Euripides' death in Macedonia.⁵⁵ He argues that the burial is not attested by any source before the late fourth century and that there is some dispute regarding the location of his tomb.⁵⁶ In addition, he notes with surprise that Aristophanes in the *Frogs* of 405 failed to mention Euripides' recent death outside Athens.⁵⁷ His final argument, and the one that has perhaps most force, is that the text of *Archelaus* was known in Athens shortly before Euripides' death in 407/6. This claim is based on the possibility that the opening lines of the prologue of *Archelaus* were quoted by Aristophanes in the *Frogs*:

Αἴγυπτος, ὡς ὁ πλεῖστος ἔσπαρται λόγος,
ἐὺν παισὶ πεντήκοντα ναυτίλῳ πλάτῃ
Ἄργος κατασχών...

Aegyptus, as the tale is generally told, with his fifty sons occupying Argos with a naval oar...

(1206–8 = fr. 846 *TrGF*).

⁵⁴ Isoc. 15.166; cf. [Aeschin.] *Epist.* 4.2–3; Paus. 1.8.4–5. Some have suspected that this tradition may have been a fourth-century invention: see Walbank (1978) 76–8; Wallace (1970) 203. Pindar, however, claims on at least one occasion to have held the office of *proxenos*, although the text is ambiguous and he could be referring to a relationship with either the Aeginetans or Epirots (Nem. 7.65 with Σ 95b Drachmann III pp. 129–30; cf. *Ol.* 9.83 and *Parth.* 2.41). For other examples of poets awarded *proxenia* in the Hellenistic period, in many cases for performances of poetry, see Marek (1984) 209–10, 263–6, 295–6, 376–9.

⁵⁵ Scullion (2003) and (2006).

⁵⁶ Scullion (2003) 397–8. The earliest account of his death is Hermesianax fr. 7.65–8 Powell. The story, in Hermesianax and the biographical tradition, that Euripides was torn apart by dogs does not inspire much confidence. Scullion argues that traditions concerning the burial of ancient authors are often far from sound: Herodotus for example was allegedly buried in Athens, Thurii, and Pella (*Suda* η 536). In Euripides' case, an actual tomb at Arethusa was identified as his grave but only by the Roman period (Adaeus *Anth. Pal.* 7.51 = *GP* 11–16; Plut. *Lyc.* 31.3; Vitruv. *de archit.* 8.3.16; Plin. *NH* 31.28; Ammian. Marcell. 27.4.8), while alternative locations at Pella and Pieria are proposed by the *Suda* ε 3695; 'Ion' *Anth. Pal.* 7.43.2 = *FGE* 567; and 7.44.5–6 = *FGE* 574–5. The discrepancy, though, can be explained in part if Pella and Pieria are essentially synonyms for Macedonia as a whole, the former being its capital, at which Euripides was presumed to have stayed in his last years, the latter the Macedonian home of the Muses, an apt, if not strictly accurate final resting place for a poet. This casual attitude to geography is demonstrated by the second of the epigrams ascribed to Ion, which erroneously situates Pella 'near' Pieria in order to conflate the two: see Page *FGE* p.158.

⁵⁷ Scullion (2003) 393.

A scholion informs us that, according to certain unnamed sources, these lines were from the beginning of *Archelaus*.⁵⁸ It is likely that Aristophanes chose lines that were well known to his audience, in some cases from recent performances. Could Euripides have returned from Macedonia and produced *Archelaus* shortly before his death? If so, Euripides' Macedonian tour probably took place before 408.

Scullion's argument outlines some tantalizing possibilities; yet a number of problems still remain. Ultimately much of the argument is based on silence, including the 'silence of the *Frogs*'. Although the tradition of the burial is recorded only in late sources, it was never challenged in antiquity and no alternative tomb was ever identified outside Macedonia.⁵⁹ Most importantly, it is uncertain whether fr. 846 was the genuine prologue of *Archelaus*. The scholion on *Frogs* rejected the attribution of these lines to the play. Its author knew of an alternative opening which focused not on Aegyptus and his sons but his brother Danaus and his fugitive daughters:

Δαναὸς ὁ πεντήκοντα θυγατέρων πατήρ
Νείλου λιπὼν κάλλιστον ἔκ γαίας ὕδωρ...

Danaus the father of fifty daughters, having left the most beautiful stream of the Nile from the earth [?]...

(fr. 228.1–2 TrGF).⁶⁰

⁵⁸ ὡς τινες ψευδῶς φασιν, Σ Ar. *Ran.* 1206b (Holwerda III 1a p. 139). One of these unidentified earlier scholars may have been Dicaearchus, the author of a collection of plot summaries of tragedies: see Sext. Emp. *Math.* 3.3; *arg. Rhés.* b 26–9. Haslam (1975) 152–6 argues that Dicaearchus was the author of the hypotheses preserved in *P.Oxy.* 2455: both they and those of Dicaearchus quoted the first line of tragedies. Dicaearchus may have given *Frogs* 1206 as the beginning of the *Archelaus*. Cf. Liapis (2001) and (2012) 62 and Scullion (2006) 189. Scullion notes that other authors roughly contemporary with Dicaearchus, such as Asclepiades or Philochorus, could also have been Aristarchus' source. Rusten (1982) argues against Haslam's suggestion that Dicaearchus was the author of the papyrus hypotheses.

⁵⁹ An empty monument to Euripides existed in Attica: μνῆμα Εὐριπίδου κενόν Paus. 1.2.2. An epigram quoted by the *Vita* (1a 10; 'Thucydides or Timotheus' *Anth. Pal.* 7.45 = FGE 1052–5), which gives Macedonia as the location of Euripides' actual grave, was possibly inscribed on this cenotaph. It may be of an early date, if the ascription of authorship to either Thucydides or Timotheus is accurate (though, as Scullion points out, this is far from certain).

⁶⁰ Anonymus *FGrHist* 647 F 1.2 and Strabo 5.2.4 attribute these lines to the *Archelaus*; Steph. Byz. α124 (p. 90 Billerbeck) quotes fr. 228.4 as from the *Archelaus*; [Plut.] *X Orat.* 837e: from a Euripidean prologue. See Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004) 338; 351.

As a result, all recent editors of the *Archelaus* have followed the *Frogs* scholion in regarding fr. 228 as the genuine opening of the play.⁶¹ Yet while fr. 846 undoubtedly belonged to a fifth-century text of Euripides' works, no author quotes fr. 228 before the second century BC. On this basis alone, fr. 846 may have a better claim to be the genuine prologue and could easily have been replaced with the lines known to Alexandrian editors.⁶² Aristarchus suggested that Euripides could have revised the text at a later date, replacing the lines of fr. 846 with those of fr. 228.⁶³ More probably an actor's interpolation, perhaps in the fourth century, was to blame.⁶⁴ Alternative prologues of Euripidean plays were common and are attested for the *Iphigenia in Aulis*, *Wise Melanippe*, *Meleager* and the, possibly inauthentic, *Rhesus*.⁶⁵ Additions to the prologue of the *Phoenician Women* are also probable.⁶⁶ Fr. 228 could have seemed an improvement on fr. 846 as it dealt with Danaus, the more famous of the two brothers, and allowed for a digression on the flooding of the Nile, the authenticity of

⁶¹ See Kannicht V/1 *TrGF* p.316; Austin (1968) 12–13; Harder (1985) 179–83; Jouan and Van Looy (1998) 289–90; Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004) 338; 351.

⁶² Other alternatives are possible but perhaps less convincing. Harder (1985) 181 argued that fr. 846 could have been the first lines of another play, which had been lost by the time of Aristarchus. However, as Scullion (2006) 188 argues, we know of no certain instance in which a play of Euripides was lost. Furthermore, as noted by Dover (1993) 339–40, if fr. 846 had belonged to a lost play, Aristarchus would probably have known about it, since the titles of plays in ancient catalogues were generally accompanied with their first lines. Alternatively, Harder suggested that the lines could have come from another play, such as *Danae* or *Dictys*, for which a prologue concerning Aegyptus would have been suitable. Yet this would still require a change in the text of those plays sometime between the fourth and second centuries. The suggestion by Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 112–13 that the two fragments both formed part of the same prologue is unlikely. Aristophanes would not have quoted the lines from fr. 846 if they were not the first lines of the original text. In addition, were fr. 846 to follow fr. 228, the prologue would effectively have to start twice and the repetition would be awkward.

⁶³ οὐ γάρ ἐστι, φησὶν Ἀρίσταρχος, τοῦ Ἀρχελαίου, εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς μετέθηκεν ὕστερον; *Σ Ar. Ran.* 1206c (Holwerda III 1a p. 139). This suggestion was endorsed by Koster (1971).

⁶⁴ Scullion (2003) 394 n.30; (2006) 189–91; Dover (1993) 340; Sommerstein (1996) 265–6. Haslam (1975) 170–1 suggests a change in the prologue was necessitated by the embarrassment caused by the quotation of the prologue in the *Frogs*.

⁶⁵ *IA*: see Kovacs (2003) 80–3; *Wise Melanippe*: fr. 480 and 481, cf. Plut. *Amator.* 756 b; *Meleager*: fr. 515 and 516 *TrGF*, cf. *Σ Ar. Ran.* 1238 (Holwerda III 1a p. 141); *Rhes.*: arg. *Rhes.* b 26–7, Liapis (2012) 62–5; see Haslam (1975) 170–1; Dover (1993) 342; Sommerstein (1996) 268.

⁶⁶ See Haslam (1975).

which is doubted even by those who believe fr. 228 to be genuine.⁶⁷ If Scullion is correct, we should be prepared to question further the notion that the travels of Euripides took place only at the end of his life as part of an exile from Athens.

One final issue to consider is whether Euripides staged only one or multiple productions in Macedonia. We have seen that the *Archelaus*, *Temenus*, and *Temenidae* all covered episodes from the Macedonian foundation myth. However, it is uncertain whether these plays were intended to be staged as a trilogy or as unconnected dramas. If the latter, could these plays have been staged at different contests on different occasions? The argument for a Macedonian trilogy was first made by Zielinski and is also followed by Scullion.⁶⁸ *Temenus* and *Temenidae* would have covered the return of the Heraclidae to Argos and the reasons for Archelaus' banishment, while the *Archelaus* would have dealt with the story of Aegae's actual foundation.

However, there are a number of reasons why such a reconstruction, though seemingly plausible, is in fact unlikely. In particular, as Harder noted, if the *Archelaus* were the final play in a Temenid trilogy, it is difficult to understand why Euripides would have felt the need to include a lengthy genealogy in the prologue.⁶⁹ At least one of the two preceding plays included Archelaus as a character, and the audience would hardly need a detailed account of his lineage and circumstances. Furthermore, there are a number of major contradictions between what we know of the *Temenus* and *Temenidae* and the prologue of the *Archelaus*. In the prologue to the *Archelaus*, the play's hero alludes to Temenus' capture of Argos:

Τήμενος δ' Ὑλλου πατρός,
ὃς Ἄργος ὠικησ' Ἡρακλέους γεγώς ἄπο.

And Temenus, son of his father Hyllus, who reoccupied Argos as a descendant of Heracles.

(fr. 228a.17–18)

Archelaus goes on to describe how, lacking an heir, Temenus went to the oracle at Dodona and was told that he would sire a son named Archelaus.⁷⁰ *P.Mich.* 1319. 11, which Harder placed in the hypothesis of the *Temenidae*, referred to Archelaus as the oldest of the sons of

⁶⁷ Fr. 228. 3–5; see Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004) 351.

⁶⁸ Zielinski (1922) 305; Webster (1967) 252–4; Scullion (2006) 191–7.

⁶⁹ Harder (1985) 127–9. ⁷⁰ Fr. 228a.19–25.

Temenus. Here the prologue of the *Archelaus* is clearly in agreement with the *Temenidae* hypothesis. However, the prologue also seems to imply that Archelaus was born only after the return of the Heraclidae, whereas in the *Temenidae* Archelaus was an adult at the time of the conquest.⁷¹

In addition, it is possible that the *Temenus* and *Temenidae* both dramatized the same episode in different ways. We have seen that the hypotheses to both plays covered the division of the Peloponnese by the casting of lots. The available fragments indicate a military context suggesting that the battle for Argos was the setting for both dramas.⁷² Given how little we know of the plot of *Temenus* certainty is impossible; yet it is conceivable that we have two plays covering the same events. If so, these works would stand in the same relation to each other as the *Phrixus* and *Hippolytus* plays, which were also alternative versions of the same episodes.⁷³ One play, perhaps *Temenus*, could have conformed to the pattern of events described in the prologue of *Archelaus*: that Temenus was the leader of the Heraclidae and that Archelaus was only born following their return to Argos. The other, perhaps the *Temenidae*, may have changed the pattern of events in order to provide Archelaus with a role in the conquest of the Peloponnese.

If we do not have a trilogy, we must assume performances of tragedies took place on at least two separate occasions, since Euripides is unlikely to have dramatized at length the same story twice on the same day. If so, he may have made more than one journey to Macedonia. Archelaus came to power in around 413. We know that Euripides was in Athens in the spring of 412 for the production of the *Andromeda* and *Helen*. Between 412 and the production of *Orestes* in 408 he staged at least one trilogy at Athens, that of the *Phoenician Women*, *Hypsipyle*, and (probably) *Antigone*, perhaps in 409.⁷⁴ It is

⁷¹ Although it is the majority opinion, this analysis has not gone unchallenged. See di Gregorio (1987) 288–90 and Scullion (2006) 191–7. They argue that the lines detailing the prophecy at Dodona, could still refer back to events that happened before the conquest. Such an arrangement would be very unusual. Collard, Cropp and Gibert (2004) 353 noted that the prologue of the *Ion* (57) contains a similar jump backwards in time, but they dismiss it because, unlike in the *Archelaus*, the time change is unambiguous.

⁷² Frs. 728, 731, and 732 attributed to *Temenidae* and frs. 743 and 744 TrGF attributed to *Temenus* are quoted as gnomic maxims on the topic of warfare.

⁷³ See Ch. 1.2.

⁷⁴ Σ Ar. *Ran.* 53a (Holwerda III 1a p. 12). See *Phoen. arg.* g 4–5; Snell TrGF DID C 16 (a) amends *Ναυσικράτους ἄρχοντος* to *Γλαυκίππου* therefore giving the date of 409. The *Oenomaus* and *Chrysippus* are given as matching plays of the *Phoenician Women*

not impossible that Euripides left Athens in the spring of 412 or later, producing the *Archelaus* in Macedonia in either the summer of 412 or in 411 or 410. In each case, he could have returned to Athens in time for the Dionysia of the following year. If we wish to be more precise, we might hazard a guess that Euripides took advantage of Archelaus' offer to avoid the temporary chaos of the oligarchic coup and the battle to restore the democracy in 411. Perhaps the *Temenus* and *Archelaus* were performed together in Macedonia at this time.⁷⁵

The *Archelaus* and *Temenus* may have been such a success that King Archelaus commissioned at least one other play: the *Temenidae*. Euripides could have returned to perform this play in 408, shortly before he died. It was more daring in its content and its manipulation of the myth than either the *Temenus* or *Archelaus* had been. Here the comment of Agatharchides on Euripides' tendency to employ poetic licence in his plays may be relevant:

οὐδ' Εὐριπίδου κατηγορῶ τῷ μὲν Ἀρχελάῳ περιτεθεικότος τὰς Τημένους πράξεις

I do not lay the charge against Euripides that he attributed to Archelaus the deeds of Temenus.

(Agatharchides 8.10–12 = Phot. *Bibl.* 444b 29)

In the *Temenidae*, Archelaus seems to have been instrumental in the victory of the Heraclidae and is named as Temenus' rightful heir. It may be this play that Agatharchides is referring to when he implies that Euripides could be accused of giving Archelaus the credit for the deeds usually performed by Temenus (i.e. the conquest of Argos). In the latter half of the play, Euripides could perhaps have enlarged

(lines 6–7). However, these plays are more probably cited as an earlier trilogy dealing with the same time period in myth, rather than plays produced in the same year as the *Phoenician Women*. See Webster (1967) 102; Mastronarde (1994) 12–13 and 36–8; Kannicht *TrGF* V/2 pp. 591–2.

⁷⁵ An objection might be made that Aristophanes *Frogs* 1338 quotes a line from the *Temenidae*. The manuscripts of a scholion on the line note that, according to Apollonius, these words were from the *Eumenides* (ἐκ τῶν Εὐμενιδῶν, Σ Ar. *Ran.* 1338 Holwerda III 1a p. 149). Because the exact line is absent from the *Eumenides*, Dobree took this as a corruption for Εὐριπίδου Τημενιδῶν. However, it is likely that Apollonius thought line 1338 was a paraphrase of *Eumenides* 1021–47, rather than a verbatim quotation: cf. Kannicht on fr. 741 *TrGF*.

upon the reasons for Archelaus' departure from Argos, which he had skipped over in the earlier plays.

What can be said in conclusion regarding the travels of Euripides in Macedonia? The biographical tradition presents Euripides' travels as the major and defining event of the last years of his life. Yet his departure from Athens need not have been as traumatic as ancient authors supposed. Indeed, perhaps we should wonder if Euripides could not have made more than one journey to Macedonia in the final decade of his life. Rather than just a tragic exile, have we also a travelling poet, who moves outside his home city in response to invitations from patrons and the offer of a platform at festivals? The possibility of an Athenian performance of *Archelaus*, or at least the wide circulation of the text, before 405 is far from certain, but remains an intriguing possibility. If correct, it suggests that Euripides envisaged reperformance for other audiences besides Macedonians, even if *Archelaus* certainly dramatized the Macedonian foundation myth and appealed directly to a Macedonian patron.⁷⁶ This may be said to conform to the general nature of tragedy and its ability to adapt to a wide range of performance contexts throughout the Greek world.

The reconstruction of Euripides' travels offered here is, admittedly, highly speculative. It rests on two ultimately unprovable assumptions: that the *Archelaus* was quoted by Aristophanes in 405 and that Euripides' three Macedonian plays were not originally conceived as a trilogy. Yet at the very least we should be willing to challenge the notion that travel was a drastic or unusual course of action for the Athenian tragedian. In the Greek imagination a poet may either be driven from his home or coaxed from it with the promise of fame and patronage. Ancient sources differ on which was the most important factor in the case of Euripides. Yet the crucial message is that the poet himself is typically predisposed to movement.

⁷⁶ Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004) 337 have followed Scullion to some extent in their commentary. They suggest that the *Archelaus* could have been written for an Athenian audience, given the positive feelings towards the Macedonian king following his offer to supply Athens with timber for ship-building (IG I³ 117 = M-L 91). However, on p. 351 they reject the suggestion, endorsed by Scullion, that fr. 846 constituted the original opening of the play.

2. EURIPIDES' *ANDROMACHE*

Although the *Vita* tradition only mentioned travels in Magnesia and Macedonia, the *Andromache* was probably composed for a different foreign tour in the 420s. A scholion on the play indicates that it was not performed at Athens and that, because of this, its date was unknown in antiquity.⁷⁷ Neither the title nor its *archon* year were listed in the *Didascaliae*. The metrical evidence, however, suggests that it was written in around 425–418, before Archelaus' accession to the throne of Macedonia.⁷⁸

How trustworthy is the scholiast's assertion? Callimachus, according to the scholion, had noted that the name Democrates was ascribed to the play.⁷⁹ Wilamowitz used this evidence to suggest that the play could have been performed at Athens, though with an unknown Democrates acting as producer.⁸⁰ However, the scholion treats *Andromache*'s première abroad as a fact and, as Page argued, 'this is expert and unambiguous evidence'.⁸¹ Moreover, an ancient scholar, faced with no evidence for the play's performance either in Athens or elsewhere, could as easily have assumed that the play was never staged.⁸² Butrica has suggested that Democrates may have appeared in the *Didascaliae* as an actor who had re-performed *Andromache* at the Dionysia, sometime after 386.⁸³ Alternatively, the scholion's Democrates may be identical with a Sicyonian of the same name, who is listed in a third-century record of dramatic performers.⁸⁴

There is therefore a strong probability that Euripides composed another tragedy for performance outside Athens a decade or more before he produced his Macedonian plays. This further undermines the notion that Euripides' activities were entirely confined to Athens

⁷⁷ εἰλικρινῶς δὲ τοὺς τοῦ δράματος χρόνους οὐκ ἔστι λαβεῖν, οὐδὲ διδασκται γὰρ Ἀθήνησιν, Σ Eur. Andr. 445 (p. 284 Schwartz).

⁷⁸ On metre and the dating of Euripides' plays see Zielinski (1925) 133–240; Ceardel (1941b); Ritchie (1964) 260–3; Dale (1967) xxiv–xxviii. The data is collated by Cropp and Fick (1985) 5. For a general discussion of the dating of the *Andromache* see Lloyd (1994) 12.

⁷⁹ ὁ δὲ Καλλίμαχος ἐπιγραφῆναι φησι τῇ τραγωδίᾳ Δημοκράτην, Σ Andr. 445 = Call. fr. 451 Pfeiffer.

⁸⁰ 'docta per Democratem', Wilamowitz (1875) 148; cf. Vahtikari (2014) 222.

⁸¹ Page (1936) 223; cf. Easterling (1994) 79.

⁸² As is noted by Butrica (2001) 189; cf. Stevens (1971) 19–20; Allan (2000) 150–2.

⁸³ See Butrica (2001) 190–7.

⁸⁴ TrGF I 124; CAT A 6 = P. Tebt. 695 col. 2.7; cf. Goossens (1962) 412 n. 24.

prior to the start of his northern 'exile'. Furthermore, we should consider the possibility that Euripides' fame had spread widely during his own lifetime as a direct result of performances in Athens (and conceivably also performances elsewhere). But where was the *Andromache* performed? Argos and Sicyon have been proposed as venues.⁸⁵ Others have pointed to the 'localization' of Thessaly in the play as possible evidence for performance there.⁸⁶ Robertson, however, suggested king Tharyps of Molossia as a possible patron and his kingdom in Epirus is the most frequently preferred option.⁸⁷ Thucydides (2.80.6) mentions Tharyps and states that he was still a minor in 429 under the guardianship of a certain Sabylinthus, who led the Molossians in support of the Peloponnesians and their allies. At a later date the Molossians appear to have switched sides. We hear from later sources that Tharyps was sent to Athens for his education and was the first king to 'reintroduce' Greek customs to Epirus.⁸⁸ These had allegedly fallen into abeyance since the time of Tharyps' heroic ancestor Neoptolemus, from whom he claimed descent.⁸⁹ If Tharyps went to Athens as a young man, as Justin claims, this visit may have taken place in around 425. And if so, he could well have brought Euripides back with him to Molossia. Like Archelaus over a decade later, Tharyps may have welcomed the opportunity to commission a play that celebrated his Hellenic descent.

The *Andromache* explicitly links the Molossian kings with Neoptolemus and Achilles. The setting is near Phasalia in Phthia (16) and the plot concerns the former wife of Hector and her son by Neoptolemus, who is named in the list of *dramatis personae* as Molossus.⁹⁰ The future of this child is an abiding concern in the play. Menelaus worries that Andromache's progeny will come to rule over Greeks in Phthia despite their barbarian ancestry (βάρβαροι δ' ὄντες γένος | Ἑλληνισιν ἄρξουσ'; 665–6). Partly because of this, Menelaus takes the boy hostage and uses

⁸⁵ Argos: Nauck (1900) I xvii n.21; Page (1936) 223–8; Sicyon: (the home of the poet Democrates), see Lesky (1972) 338 n. 90.

⁸⁶ Goossens (1962) 376–7, 385–6; Bernand (1985) 238–41; Taplin (1999) 45.

⁸⁷ Robertson (1923); Nilsson (1951) 83; Allan (2000) 151–9; Butrica (2001) 189–90; cf. Cairns (2012) 39, who suspects that the play could have been performed first in either Molossia or Thessaly.

⁸⁸ Plut. *Pyrr.* 1.4; Justin 17.3.11.

⁸⁹ ἀπὸ δὲ Θαρύπου ἐς Πύρρον τὸν Ἀχιλλέως πέντε ἀνδρῶν καὶ δέκα εἰς αἰ γενεαί Paus. 1.11.1. 5–7; cf. Plut. *Pyrr.* 1.4–5.

⁹⁰ *arg. Andr.* 28. For the founding-hero Molossus see Σ Pind. *Nem.* 7.56a (Drachmann III p. 124); Paus. 1.11.1–2.

him to draw Andromache out from the shrine of Thetis, at which she has taken sanctuary. Mother and child are saved only just in time by Peleus. The old man declares that his great-grandson will be brought up in Phthia as an enemy of Menelaus and the Spartans (ἐν Φθίᾳ σ' ἐγὼ | θρέψω μέγαν τοῖσδ' ἐχθρόν, 723–4). Yet events turn out otherwise when Neoptolemus is murdered in Delphi. Following the messenger speech, Thetis appears and delivers a prophecy concerning the boy. He will live with his mother in Molossia and his descendants will be kings in that land:

βασιλέα δ' ἐκ τοῦδε χρὴ
ἄλλον δι' ἄλλον διαπερᾶν Μολοσσίας
εὐδαιμονούντας·

It is fated that from this child will be descended an unbroken line of kings, ruling in prosperity over Molossia.

(1247–9)

Like the *Archelaus*, the *Andromache* dramatizes the events leading up to the founding of a dynasty, though in this case it links the kings of Molossia directly to Achilles and the Aeacids. In both plays the heroes leave to establish their new kingdoms at the instigation of a *deus ex machina*. As in the *Aetnaeae* of Aeschylus, and possibly also the *Archelaus*, the final scene of the play predicted the future success of the new foundation.

Tharyps is thus a very plausible candidate for Euripides' patron, even if we cannot name him as one with absolute certainty. Yet in trying to identify a particular performance context, scholars have perhaps lost sight of the play's real importance. Despite the prominence of the Molossian foundation myth, *Andromache* is in fact a tragedy that could have appealed to multiple audiences, and specifically a Panhellenic one. The reason for this general appeal is principally that the *Andromache* is a play about travel, on the same model as *Archelaus*. While the Macedonian plays situate the Macedonian royal line in the context of the Heraclid migration, *Andromache* links the Molossian kings to the overall narrative of the Returns of the heroes from Troy.

The 'Returns', or *Nostoi*, is actually a misnomer, since very few of the Achaeans ever returned to their places of origin. Instead, like the migration of the Heraclidae, this myth provides an alternative source of foundation stories. This tendency is well demonstrated by the example of the Aeacidae. Peleus and Telamon were both sons of Aeacus from Aegina, who were exiled for the killing of their

half-brother Phocus, an event to which Menelaus alludes in the *Andromache*.⁹¹ The two Aeacids settle in Thessaly and Salamis respectively. When Telamon's own son Teucer later comes home from the Trojan War, he is driven away by his father as punishment for failing to return with his brother Ajax. He leaves to found Salamis on Cyprus. The story of his banishment formed the subject of at least one tragedy by Sophocles, the *Teucer* (frr. 576–9b *TrGF*; cf. Soph. *Aj.* 1008–20) and was also celebrated by Pindar in his *Nemean Odes* for Aegean boy victors.

The return of Peleus' grandson (and Teucer's cousin) Neoptolemus is similarly a frustrated *nostos* that leads to the settling of a new location, Molossia. In Pindar's *Nemean* ode for the Aeginetan Sogenes (7.36–9), the death of Ajax at Troy is compared with the return of Neoptolemus. Here we are told that Neoptolemus failed to return to Scyros, the homeland of his birth, but became king instead in Molossia for a short time.⁹² A version of this same foundation myth was also recounted in the epic *Nostoi* of Agias.⁹³ Neoptolemus' final resting place was not in fact his home, or even his adoptive home of Molossia, but Delphi, one of the ultimate gathering-places for travelling strangers, where his tomb would become a focus for cult and processions.⁹⁴

In accounting for the dispersal of the Hellenic race across the Aegean and Greek mainland, myths of this type connect Greek communities through common genealogical links. In his fourth *Nemean* (also for an Aeginetan victor), Pindar explicitly declares that he is creating a song that is beloved of both Aegina and Cyprus, through their shared connection to the Aeacids and Teucer.⁹⁵ Pindar goes on to draw further connections: to Salamis, the homeland of Ajax (48), to the Black Sea, where Achilles spent his afterlife (49–50), to Phthia, where Thetis is said to rule (50), and to the mainland between Dodona and the Ionian Sea (that is Epirus), where Neoptolemus dwells (51–3). On this

⁹¹ *Andr.* 687; cf. Σ *ad loc.* Schwartz; Pind. *Nem.* 5.12–16.

⁹² Μολοσσία δ' ἐμβασιλευεν ὀλίγον | χρόνον, 38–9; Neoptolemus and Scyros see: *Il.* 19.326–33; *Cypria* Arg. 7c, West (2013c) 107; Eur. *Andr.* 14.

⁹³ See West (2013a) 263–4, who doubts that the Molossian foundation myth was part of the early epic cycle.

⁹⁴ *Nem.* 7.34–5, 40–7; note the description of the Delphians as those who 'welcome strangers' (ξεναγέται, 43).

⁹⁵ μέλος πεφιλημένον | Οἰνῶνα τε καὶ Κύπρῳ, ἔνθα Τεῦκρος ἀπάρχει, | ὁ Τελαμωνιάδας. *Nem.* 4.45–7.

occasion, however, Pindar's choice of myth is centred on Iolcus and Peleus' adventures there; yet the list of locations is intended to illustrate the extent of the Aeacids' (and by extension their homeland Aegina's) contribution to the story of the Greeks and the choice of subject matter available to the poet. Pindar's principal focus is on Aegina, but his aim is to illustrate the island's place within the wider Greek story. Through the myth of the Aeacidae and their travels before and after the Trojan War, Pindar links the island into a network of associations, stretching from nearby Salamis, to Cyprus and Molossia.

Euripides' play has much the same effect, for it is primarily a story of migration and exile (perhaps one reason why scholars have frequently seen the *Andromache* as a collection of disconnected scenes and unexpected arrivals).⁹⁶ The move to Molossia is only the final journey undertaken by the drama's protagonists. One type of travel that is prominent in the play is pilgrimage (θεωρία). At its opening, Neoptolemus has already departed for Delphi, from which there will be no homecoming.⁹⁷ He has gone primarily to sacrifice to Apollo in an attempt to assuage the god's anger after an earlier offence, but we are also told that Neoptolemus and his companions spent three days in viewing (θεα, 1087) the sights. Delphi and other sanctuaries, such as Dodona, to which Orestes claims to be travelling (885–6), form fixed points on the journeys of the heroes. The same is true of the monuments they contain, including Neoptolemus' eventual tomb (1240–1). New associations are created as the heroes pause along the way.

Phthia is itself a temporary stopping place in the overall narrative of migration. It is not only Andromache, but also Menelaus, Hermione, and Orestes who are strangers there. In the prologue, Andromache looks back to her origins in Thebe, a city in Asia (Ἀσιاتیδος γῆς σχῆμα, Θηβαία πόλις, 1), and her former life in Troy as Hector's wife (2–5). As is frequently emphasized during the course of the play, she has come as a stranger to Greece and a Greek city (Ἑλλάδ' εἰσαφικόμην, 13; cf. 169, 203, 244, 663–6, 1044), but in doing so she will unite both Trojans and Hellenes into one race. Thetis' prediction at the play's close that Andromache will marry the Trojan seer Helenus, who in some traditions becomes king of Epirus, links

⁹⁶ For a full discussion and bibliography see Allan (2000) 40–85.

⁹⁷ On the frustrated homecoming as a unifying theme in the play, see Mossman (1996).

the Molossians with both sides in the Trojan War.⁹⁸ In the same way, Hermione looks back to her place of origin when she draws attention to the finery she wears, which came as part of her dowry from Sparta (151). Andromache had similarly mentioned her original dowry (πολυχρύσω χλιδῇ, 2) to indicate her change of fortune: once a wife and a princess, she is now a slave and a concubine. Like Andromache, by the end of the play Hermione will be left childless and a widow, transported to a different land (Argos) by another man (Orestes). The play, in itself, thus creates a web of connections and associations: Phthia stands at its centre, with links branching out from Troy, to Argos, Sparta, the Panhellenic centre of Delphi, and finally Molossia, where Andromache's journey comes to its end.

In the *Andromache*, Euripides appears to have created a similar tragedy to his later play the *Archelaus*. He has dramatized a well-established foundation myth: on this occasion that of the Molossian kings. As in the *Archelaus*, it is a story of travel, whereby an exiled hero is threatened in one locality and shown the means to establish a permanent kingdom in another. As such, a performance in Epirus in the 420s or early 410s seems likely, though it cannot be established with certainty. Yet it would be a mistake to rule out other potential venues or to treat the *Andromache* as a Molossian, rather than an Athenian or Macedonian, drama. Rather it is a Greek tragedy. Just as Pindar had celebrated the island of Aegina with reference to the travels of the Aeacids, so Euripides in the following generation reaffirmed the heroic and Hellenic lineage of the Molossian kings. Epirus is linked to the defining moment in Greek history, the Trojan war, through the migrations of the heroes following the capture of Troy.

3. EURIPIDES' CAPTIVE MELANIPPE AND AEOLUS

a. The Myth and the Plays

The plays we have examined so far were all probably staged outside Athens during the last quarter of the fifth century. The works themselves situate a dynasty, that of the Macedonians or the Molossians,

⁹⁸ 1233–45; cf. Dio Chrys. 11.137; Paus. 1.11.1.

within a Panhellenic narrative of travel and migration. Moreover, in the case of *Archelaus* and *Andromache*, later ancient sources attest to their performance outside Attica in Euripides' lifetime. No such evidence exists for our final pair of plays, the *Captive Melanippe* and *Aeolus*. However, these works appear to have resembled *Archelaus* and *Andromache* in a number of important ways. Firstly, they form part of another Panhellenic cycle of migration, in this case of the descendants of Aeolus, and secondly, as in the *Archelaus*, Euripides makes significant changes to an established myth. These changes suggest that the plays were intended for performance or reperformance in the Greek West.

The story of Melanippe is part of the defining Panhellenic myth: that of the children of Hellen. Euripides composed two tragedies on the life of this heroine: *Wise Melanippe* and *Captive Melanippe*. In *Wise Melanippe*, she is the daughter of Aeolus, the son of Hellen, and Hippo, the daughter of the centaur Chiron.⁹⁹ Hellen had three sons: Aeolus, Xuthus (who ruled Attica after marrying Creusa), and Dorus, the ancestor of the Dorians. From these brothers, Melanippe declares in the prologue, the various branches of the Hellenic race were descended.¹⁰⁰ Aeolus thus appears as a common ancestor for a significant part of the Greek race and stands in the same relation to his descendants as Heracles and Dorus to the Dorians. In *Wise Melanippe* the scene of the action is Thessaly, where Aeolus son of Hellen is established, giving the land the name Aeolian.¹⁰¹ When the play begins, Melanippe has been raped by Poseidon in her father's absence and has given birth in secret to twins, who are later named Aeolus and Boeotus. The children are left by their mother in an ox-stall. They are later discovered by shepherds, who see the babies suckling on a cow and assume that the animal has miraculously given birth to human offspring. On Hellen's advice Aeolus plans to sacrifice his own grandchildren, but is dissuaded from doing so by a cunning speech given by Melanippe, hence the title of the play.¹⁰²

The other drama, *Captive Melanippe*, takes place somewhat later in time. The plot can be roughly reconstructed from the accounts of

⁹⁹ Fr. 481.13–22. ¹⁰⁰ Eur. fr. 481.7–8; [Hes.] fr. 9 M–W.

¹⁰¹ Eur. fr. 481.5–6; cf. [Hes.] fr. 6 M–W; Strab. 8.7.1; Diod. Sic. 4.67.2.

¹⁰² For the hypothesis of the play see Collard, Cropp, and Lee (2009) 248. Melanippe's speech: Arist. *Poet.* 1454a28; Dionys. Hal. *Art Rhet.* 8.10 and 9.11.

Hyginus and Diodorus. The setting has moved to Italy.¹⁰³ According to Diodorus, the mother of Aeolus and Boeotus, named Arne in his account, went into exile with a stranger from Metapontum.¹⁰⁴ This was because her father did not believe that her pregnancy was due to the god Poseidon and wished to punish her. Hyginus has Melanippe's father—named Aeolus or Desmontes (a mistake derived from the title of Euripides' play)—imprison her.¹⁰⁵ It seems that Melanippe and her children have been separated somehow. Hyginus claims that Melanippe's twins were recovered by shepherds and have grown to manhood apart from their mother in the care of a certain king Metapontus and his wife. Here we see that Diodorus' nameless Metapontian is in fact a mistake for Metapontus, the eponymous hero of the city.

Metapontus' wife—named Siris by Euripides (fr. 496 = Athen. 523d), Theano by Hyginus and Autolyte by Diodorus—takes the role of the evil stepmother. The name Siris links this character to the Italian city or river of the same name, later re-founded as Heraclea. Jealous of Aeolus and Boeotus, who threaten to supplant her own sons, she plots their murder. From a surviving papyrus fragment we know that her brothers attack Aeolus and Boeotus during the course of a hunting expedition, but are unsuccessful and die in the attempt.¹⁰⁶ Hyginus indicates that Poseidon came to the aid of his sons and caused the fight to go against their attackers. Siris, a similar character to Dirce in the *Antiope*, was probably also responsible for Melanippe's imprisonment. According to Hyginus, Poseidon reveals to the twins their true parentage and they take revenge on Melanippe's father. In the play it was probably the evil step-mother who was punished.¹⁰⁷ Metapontus, who has been absent, returns and brings the action to a close by marrying Melanippe.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰³ Antiochus Syrac. *FGrHist* 555 F 12 = Strabo 6.1.15; *Metapontus rex Icariae*, Hyg. *Fab.* 186.4. *Italiae*: Kannicht *TrGF* V/1 p.538; Collard, Cropp, and Lee (2009) 243. Antiochus included Metapontum within the bounds of 'Italia'. See Webster (1967) 150–1.

¹⁰⁴ *Μεταποντίω ξένω*, Diod. Sic. 4.67.4. ¹⁰⁵ Hyg. *Fab.* 186.1.

¹⁰⁶ Fr. 495 *TrGF*; cf. *cum in venatione exierint, eos cultris interficite*, Hyg. *Fab.* 186.6.

¹⁰⁷ *βοηθοῦντες* [sc. Aeolus and Boeotus] *τῇ μητρὶ τὴν Αὐτολύτην ἀνείλον*, Diod. Sic. 4.67.5; *Theano cultro venatorio se interfecit*, Hyg. *Fab.* 186.7. See Webster (1967) 150–1.

¹⁰⁸ *Metapontus duxit coniugio Melanippen eosque sibi filios adoptavit*, Hyg. *Fab.* 185.10.

Euripides, therefore, removed Melanippe and her sons from her Thessalian homeland, the setting for the *Wise Melanippe*, and transplanted them to Italy. In doing so, he seems to have created the eponymous heroes Metapontus and Siris, who give their names to the southern Italian cities of Metapontum and Siris respectively. This was a radical step.¹⁰⁹ Antiochus of Syracuse (*FGrHist* 555 F 12 = *EGM* fr. 12), a late fifth-century historian of Italy and Sicily, believed that the name Metapontus, and his association with Melanippe, was a later development. According to Strabo (6.1.15), Antiochus cited the evidence of the sixth-century poet Asius (fr. 2 *EGF*), who connected Melanippe with an otherwise unknown Dius, in whose halls she gave birth to Boeotus. Asius showed no awareness of Metabos, the earlier Italian founding hero mentioned by Antiochus. In addition, Strabo seems to have associated Metapontus with the play *Captive Melanippe*:

ἐνταῦθα δὲ καὶ τὸν Μετάποντον μυθεύουσι καὶ τὴν Μελανίππην τὴν δεσμῶτιν καὶ τὸν ἐξ αὐτῆς Βοιωτόν.

From here comes the myth of Metapontus and Captive Melanippe and her son Boeotus.

(Strabo 6.1.15)

The phrase ‘Captive Melanippe’ suggests that Euripides’ play was the main and possibly the earliest source. As has been suggested by Nafissi, Antiochus might also have known of Euripides’ play and, if so, could have deliberately set out to repudiate the tragedian’s version of events.¹¹⁰ The woman Siris may likewise have been a Euripidean invention, designed to make the connection with Italy and Metapontum that much more obvious. Archilochus, by contrast, understood the city of Siris to have been named after a river.¹¹¹ Neither Diodorus nor Hyginus use this name for Melanippe’s persecutor.

Earlier versions of the myth, by contrast, strongly associated Melanippe/Arne and the Thessalian Aeolus with the Boeotian foundation myth. This is particularly evident in the tradition by which Arne and Poseidon are the parents of Boeotus.¹¹² The name Arne probably

¹⁰⁹ As argued by Webster (1967) 156; Nafissi (1997) 342–3.

¹¹⁰ Nafissi (1997) 346.

¹¹¹ ὠνομάσθη δ’ ἡ Σίρις, ὡς μὲν Τίμαιος φησιν καὶ Εὐριπίδης ἐν Δεσμώτιδι Μελανίππῃ, ἀπὸ γυναικὸς τινος Σίριδος, ὡς δ’ Ἀρχίλοχος ἀπὸ ποταμοῦ, Athen. 523d = Archilochus fr. 22 West.

¹¹² Diod. Sic. 4.67; Σ *Il.* 2.494; Nicocrates *FGrHist* 376 F 5.

derives from a tradition—known to Thucydides (1.12.3; cf. Strabo 9.2.3)—that the colonizers of Boeotia came from Arne in Thessaly. The story in *Wise Melanippe* that the twins were suckled by a cow (βοῦς) similarly provides an etymology for Boeotus and Boeotia.¹¹³ Diodorus and his sources later attempted to combine the Italian myth known from Euripides with the Thessalian and Boeotian tradition. According to this version, Arne and Boeotus returned to Thessaly after their Italian excursion and it is from them that the Boeotians claim descent (Diod. Sic. 4.67.6).

The myth found in *Wise Melanippe* was almost certainly the canonical version, while the move to Italy in *Captive Melanippe* lacks any known precedent. What prompted Euripides to make the connection with Metapontum and Siris so blatant? The missing link is Aeolus son of Hippotes, the master of the winds, whom Odysseus visits on his travels in the tenth book of the *Odyssey*. This Aeolus has a strong connection with the West. The floating island of the *Odyssey* (10.3) was linked to Lipari in antiquity and Aeolus was thought to have given his name to the Aeolian Islands: the setting for Euripides' *Aeolus*.¹¹⁴ In the *Odyssey* (10.5–7), Aeolus has six sons and six daughters who are married incestuously to each other. Euripides used this description of the family to construct the plot of his *Aeolus*, in which an incestuous union between one son, Macareus, and his sister Canace, leads to disaster for the pair. These sons, according to Diodorus, inherited Italy and Sicily between them, just as the sons of Hellen (Aeolus, Xuthus, and Dorus) had founded the three main kingdoms in Greece itself.¹¹⁵ To add to the confusion, one of the sons of the Italian Aeolus, Xuthus, founded Xuthia in Sicily (an area in the region of Leontini).¹¹⁶ Euripides appears to have provided in

¹¹³ Fr. 489 *TrGF*; cf. Hellanicus fr. 123 *EGM* for the similar explanation for the name Pelias, who was suckled by a mare. According to an alternative tradition, Boeotia was named after the cow given as a sign to Cadmus for the foundation of Thebes (see *Σ Il.* 2.494, Apollod. 3.4.1).

¹¹⁴ *Αἰολία νῆσοι πρὸς τῇ Σικελίᾳ ζ'*, *Σ Q Od.* 10.1 (p.443 Dindorf); Thuc. 3.88.1; Diod. Sic. 5.7–8, 4.67.6; Servius in Verg. *Aen.* 1. 52.

¹¹⁵ Diod. Sic. 5.8.1–2 = Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 164; see Poli-Palladini (2001) 297–300.

¹¹⁶ On this Xuthus, who is only mentioned by Diodorus, and a possible connection to his more famous namesake see Smith (2012). Although Smith wishes to see the two as potentially interchangeable, it is likely that they were always seen as distinct individuals and never confused in quite the same way as the character of Aeolus. The founding-hero Xuthus was probably given to the little-known locality in order to

the *Captive Melanippe* a new Western Greek foundation myth modelled on the earlier Aeolian foundation myth in the *Wise Melanippe*.

Aeolus son of Hellen and Aeolus son of Hippotes seem originally to have been unconnected. However, the Italian setting for the *Captive Melanippe* suggests that Euripides tried to link the two by confusing Aeolus son of Poseidon and Melanippe with Aeolus son of Hippotes. Euripides' *Aeolus* referred to Salmoneus, the son of Aeolus son of Hellen, and the rape of his daughter Tyro; we do not know the context but it is conceivable that the Italian Aeolus (the one usually termed Hippotades) was presented as a relative of Salmoneus through Melanippe.¹¹⁷ The merging of Aeolus son of Hippotes and Aeolus son of Melanippe is certainly attested in our later sources. Diodorus states that the Italian Aeolus, who gave his name to the Aeolian Islands, was in fact the brother of Boeotus and the son of Poseidon.¹¹⁸ A scholion on the *Odyssey* refers to a tradition that there were two Aeoluses in addition to the original son of Hellen: a son of Hippotes and Melanippe and a son of Poseidon and Arne.¹¹⁹ The scholion cites Asclepiades of Tragilus (*FGrHist* 12 F 26), the late fourth-century author of the *Tragodoumena* (a work on myths in tragedy), who identified the master of the winds visited by Odysseus as the third Aeolus. Asclepiades seems to have attempted to reconcile the two competing traditions found in Homer and Euripides.

It is quite possible that Aeolus the son of Melanippe was presented in the play as the eponymous hero of the Aeolian Islands and the father of the founding kings of Italy and Sicily, a role usually assumed

explain an indigenous Italian name. Because a Xuthus was known to have been a brother of Aeolus son of Hellen, it was an easy step to make the Sicilian Xuthus the son of Aeolus son of Hippotes.

¹¹⁷ Fr. 14 *TrGF*= Strabo 8.3.32. Salmoneus: [Hes.] fr. 10 M–W; Diod. Sic. 4.68.1. Another possible connection is that both the *Aeolus* and the story of Tyro, which was dramatized by Sophocles, concern illicit pregnancies. However, there are perhaps stronger similarities between Melanippe and Tyro: both heroines were impregnated by a god, persecuted by a jealous wife, and saved by their twin sons (in Tyro's case Neleus and Pelias; see especially Soph. fr. 657 *TrGF*; cf. Men. *Epit.* 325).

¹¹⁸ Diod. Sic. 4.67.6; however Diodorus (5.7.6–7) also notes that the Aeolus whom Odysseus visited was the son of Hippotes.

¹¹⁹ τρεῖς γὰρ Αἰόλους φασὶ γενεῆσθαι, πρῶτον τὸν τοῦ Ἑλλήνος, δεύτερον τὸν ἐξ Ἰππότου καὶ Μελανίππης, τρίτον τὸν ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος καὶ Ἄρνης. πρὸς τοῦτον δέ φησιν ὁ Ἀσκληπιάδης τὸν Ὀδυσσεῖα ἐλθεῖν τὸν ἐκ Ποσειδῶνος. φυλάσσει δὲ Ὅμηρος τὸ εἰπεῖν ἐξ Ἰππότου, Σ Q *Od.* 10. 2 (p.444 Dindorf). Cf. *Aeolus Hippotae sive Iovis sive Neptuni filius*, Servius in Verg. *Aen.* 1.52; Diodorus 4.67.2–6, where Hippotes is the son of Mimas, the son of Aeolus, the son of Hellen.

by Aeolus son of Hippotes. This merging of two men named Aeolus caused a great deal of confusion in antiquity.¹²⁰ We cannot be absolutely certain whether it was Euripides who first caused this confusion, but either way he definitely contributed to it.¹²¹ If the innovation was by Euripides, how did he confront the serious difficulty that the Aeolus in the *Odyssey* was the son of Hippotes? Little or nothing was known of Hippotes in antiquity and, were it not for the impeccable authority of Homer, his removal from the genealogy would have presented few difficulties.¹²² In addition, Euripides seems to have had a solution prepared in *Wise Melanippe*. The heroine's mother, we will recall, was the horse-goddess Hippo, the daughter of Chiron the centaur. Euripides may have connected Hippotes in some way with Hippo or Chiron. Furthermore, Poseidon was strongly associated with horses and Hippotes could have been seen as a synonym for the god.¹²³

Euripides, therefore, not only moved Melanippe to Italy for the second of his two plays on this myth; he also created two founding heroes of Greek cities in southern Italy and probably identified Aeolus Hippotades with Aeolus son of Melanippe, perhaps for the first time. As a result, the ancestor of the Italian kings became the direct descendant of the father of the entire Greek race, Hellen. Boeotus, the brother of Aeolus and hero of the Boeotians, may have provided another link back to Greece itself, with the twins representing between them the two halves of the Greek world. As with the Macedonians and Molossians, Euripides appears not only to have created a heroic ancestry for the Italian Greeks, but also to

¹²⁰ See Jakoby ap. *FGrHist* Ia p. 488; *EGM* II 187–9.

¹²¹ Lloyd-Jones (1991) argued that *P.Oxy.* 3876, fr. 62 = Stesichorus fr. 247 Finglass, which is attributed by Haslam to Stesichorus, may suggest an earlier link between Aeolus Hippotades and Aeolus the son of Hellen. However, as Haslam (1991) points out, this claim rests on a number of unproven assumptions; cf. Finglass p. 553.

¹²² Smith (2012) 117–18 claims that Hippotes, the father of Aeolus, was the same man as another Hippotes son of Phylas ([Apollod.] *Bibl.* 2.174–5 and Paus. 3.13.3–4). This Hippotes was a Heraclid who participated in the expedition of Temenus and his brothers, killing, along the way, the seer Carnus: the founder of the Carneia. However, in the tradition followed by Diodorus (4.67.3), the Italian Hippotes was the son of Mimas, not Phylas. Moreover, none of the sources Smith cites explicitly state that the Heraclid Hippotes was the father of Aeolus. Rather he is known to have fathered another son Aletes. The two are connected with the foundation of Corinth (on this myth see Robertson (1980) 4–10) and probably do not have any direct connection with the Aeolian Isles and Italy.

¹²³ Lloyd-Jones (1991) 299 = (2005) 41.

have re-affirmed their Hellenic identity and connections with the rest of the Greek world. Once again we have a set of plays that are firmly Panhellenic, in the sense that they build genealogical and mythical connections between Greek communities.

If Euripides, or any other poet or actor after him, had considered visiting the Greek cities of southern Italy and Sicily, the *Captive Melanippe* and *Aeolus* would be ideal texts to choose for such a tour. It is worth noting that Euripides was not the only foreign poet to have concerned himself with the heroic ancestry of the Italian Greeks, and specifically those of Metapontum. In the previous generation, Bacchylides had traced the ancestry of the Metapontines back to Nestor and the Greeks who fought at Troy, as part of an ode for the boy athlete Alexidamas.¹²⁴ This myth provides an alternative Aeolian ancestry for the Metapontines, through Nestor's father Neleus and his grandfather Salmoneus.¹²⁵ Or according to another tradition related by Antiochus (Strabo 6.1.15), they were Achaeans, invited to Italy by Sybaris in order to counter the growing power of Dorian Taras. Either way, such mythical ancestors provided the new city with an heroic past, useful for asserting their territorial claims against either the Tarantines or Ionian Siris, which was destroyed by a coalition formed of Metapontum, Sybaris and Croton in the mid sixth century.¹²⁶ Euripides' play may have had a similar purpose.

b. Possibilities for Performance

Wise Melanippe, *Captive Melanippe*, and *Aeolus* were certainly dramas well suited to travel and dissemination outside Athens. Yet no record for the performance of the plays survives from antiquity. *Wise Melanippe* was quoted by Aristophanes in 412 and *Captive Melanippe* by Eupolis in 411.¹²⁷ The metrical evidence for both plays suggests that they could have been produced in around

¹²⁴ Bacchyl. 11.113–16 Maehler.

¹²⁵ See EGM II 162–4.

¹²⁶ Malkin (1998) 210–11. Mele (1998) 67 and 70–7 has similarly argued that the Melanippe myth came about as a result of this influx of Achaeans. On the colonization of Metapontum and its identity see Carter (J.C.) (2004). On Siris and its Ionian identity see J.M. Hall (2002) 56–65.

¹²⁷ *Wise Melanippe*: fr. 482 = Ar. *Lys.* 1125 = Σ 1125 (Holwerda II 4 p. 50); fr. 487 = Ar. *Thesm.* 272 = Σ *Thesm.* 272 (Holwerda III 2 p.30) = Σ Ran. 100a (Holwerda III 1a p.19); *Captive Melanippe*: fr.507.1 = Eupolis fr. 99.102 K–A.

421–413; roughly the same period in which the *Andromache* was composed or a little later.¹²⁸ The *Aeolus* can be dated to before Aristophanes' *Peace* of 421 and *Clouds* of 423–417.¹²⁹ When exactly they were staged and whether they were performed together or on separate occasions is unknown. Since they were all quoted by Athenian comedians, it is reasonable to assume that these plays received at least one performance in Athens. The *Aeolus* became especially popular with the comic poets, especially as an illustration of Euripides' supposed moral relativism and his tolerance of sexual depravity.¹³⁰

Given the strong Italian localizations, could Euripides have also envisaged a performance or reperformance of *Captive Melanippe* and *Aeolus* in the Greek West? Metapontum was an Athenian ally in the last quarter of the fifth century and would, in theory, have had little difficulty in acquiring or even commissioning texts from a celebrated Athenian poet. An Athenian fleet was also active in Sicily between 427 and 424. Thucydides reports that Demosthenes stopped at Metapontum for reinforcements on the way to Sicily in 413 (7.33, cf. 7.57) and it is likely to have been an important staging post in the 420s as well. Easterling has suggested that Euripides might have deliberately lavished praise on certain regions and cities because he intended for his plays to be re-performed there.¹³¹ In addition to the *Captive Melanippe*, she notes the praise of Sicily and Italy in the first stasimon of the *Trojan Women* (220–9) and the mention of the 'Sicilian Sea' at the close of *Electra* (1347–8).¹³² She also comments on the '(untraditional) setting' of Mount Etna for the action of Euripides' *Cyclops* and the 'insistent references' to this location throughout.¹³³ Such

¹²⁸ See Cropp and Fick (1985) 83–4.

¹²⁹ Ar. *Nub.* 1371–2; *Pax* 114–19 = fr. 17–18 TrGF. The metrical evidence confirms an early date: see Cropp and Fick (1985) 72.

¹³⁰ Ar. *Ran.* 863, 1081, and 1475 (which paraphrases fr. 19 TrGF); *Thesm.* 177–8 = fr. 28 TrGF; cf. Pl. *Leg.* 838c; comedies on Aeolus: Ar. fr. 1–16 K–A; Antiphanes fr. 19–20 K–A; Eriphus fr. 1 K–A; see Vahtikari (2014) 229; Xanthakis-Karamanos and Mimidou (2014) 51–2.

¹³¹ Easterling (1994) 73–4.

¹³² Easterling (1994) 80 n. 24: 'Some of Euripides' lost plays have western settings: *Melanippe in Chains* at Metapontum and *Aeolus* (presumably) at Lipari. In view of what is known about the theatrical interest of these places at slightly later times we should at least give thought to the possibility that Euripides had links with them.' A similar suggestion is also made by Csapo (2010a) 98.

¹³³ Easterling (1994) 79. References to Sicily and Etna: *Cyc.* 20, 62, 95, 106, 114, 130, 298, 366, 395, 599, 660, 703. Other interpretations, however, are possible. O'Sullivan (2012) 182–7, for example, claims that the references to Sicily are a

localizations alone do not make a compelling case for performance. However, the *Captive Melanippe* is unusual because its heroine was never previously associated with the Greek West. The *Archelaus* is one example of a play in which Euripides changed a detail of the established myth to appeal to his patron. Could the *Captive Melanippe* be another?

Circumstantial evidence points to either the performance of plays or the circulation of texts in southern Italy by at least 400, and possibly even during Euripides' lifetime. Images plausibly linked to plays by Euripides and other tragedians have been found on some of the earliest vases produced in Lucania, the region in which the cities of Metapontum and Siris (re-founded in the fifth century as Heraclea) were situated. At the end of the fifth century the Greeks of Italy and Sicily gradually ceased to import Athenian vases and began to develop local workshops (in some cases started by immigrants from Athens). Over the past two decades, a re-evaluation of these vases has, perhaps more than anything else, prompted scholars to consider the possibility of tragedy's dissemination in the classical period.¹³⁴ This material, however, should be treated with some caution. Unlike their comic counterparts, images related to tragedy keep the sense of dramatic illusion contained within the genre.¹³⁵ We should not view the depictions of drama on these vases as 'illustrations' of either a text or a particular theatrical performance, but rather as depictions of

negative commentary on the habits of Sicilians, and their tyrants in particular. Seaford (1982) 172 and (1998) 55 argues that the play deliberately alludes to the imprisonment of Athenians in the Syracusan stone quarries. Odysseus' connection with the Greek West had perhaps been established from the time of Hesiod (*Theog.* 1011–18). The authenticity of this passage has been questioned and, as a result, the date is uncertain. See West (1966) 433–6, who suggests that this passage dates from the sixth century when Greeks were increasingly coming into contact with Etruscans. Malkin (1998) 178–85, however, argues that the passage should be seen in the context of the early stages of Greek colonization in Italy around 700 BC.

¹³⁴ See esp. Taplin (1993) 1–10 and (2007) 7–22; Dearden (1999) 236–44 and Allan (2001).

¹³⁵ See Green (1994) 26–7. Taplin (2007) 35–43 has compiled a list of vase paintings which are plausibly linked to tragedy, and has proceeded to delicately weigh up what he calls 'pro-' and 'contraindications'. He seeks to counter the scepticism of Giuliani (2001) 37, who argued that vases related to tragedy 'never [his emphasis]... contain any element that would refer to the dramaturgic reality of theatre production: no costumes, no masks, no stage'; cf. Giuliani (1996) 73–4. A notable exception is the late fourth-century calyx crater of the Capadorso Painter, which possibly recreates the final revelation scene of the *Oedipus the Tyrant* (924–1085), with the addition of a stage: Syracuse 66557 = MTS² no. ST5 pp. 124 and 150; see C–S 63–4; Green (1994) 61 and Taplin (2007) 90–2 no. 22.

myth, which may or may not be indirectly inspired by tragedy.¹³⁶ If a link with tragedy can be established in a given vase, it may mark not the moment of that tragedy's first performance, but rather the point at which a version of the myth known from tragedy came to be adopted as a subject by painters.

A good example is the Cleveland Medea, which appears to depict the concluding scene of Euripides' play.¹³⁷ This Lucanian crater, made in around 400, was found in the Greek city of Heraclea (Policoro), south-west of Metapontum on the Gulf of Taranto. In the centre Medea, encircled by the rays of the sun, is driving her serpent chariot. This was sent by the sun-god Helios at the end of the play (1321–2). The children lie dead on an altar to the right, where an old woman and man are grieving for them (possibly the *paedagogus* and nurse, who had tried to protect the children in lines 89–95). To the left, Jason stands with his sword. Above are two hideous winged Erinyes, who are invoked in the text by Jason (1389). On the reverse is Euripides' version of the Telephus myth: Telephus kneels on an altar clutching Orestes and a drawn sword.¹³⁸

We can compare these images to three other vases dating from the same period, also from Policoro. Another less spectacular Medea scene closely resembles the one in Cleveland, this time on a hydria rather than a crater.¹³⁹ It is the work of the Policoro painter, who may have been responsible for the Cleveland crater. These are the earliest images of Medea's escape and nothing comparable is known in the

¹³⁶ The relationship between literature and art in antiquity is uncertain and has long been a topic of fierce debate, as is evident in early studies by Robert (1881) and Huddilston (1898). Giuliani (1996) has termed the two camps 'philodramatists' and 'iconocentrists'; cf. Taplin (2007) 23–4 who also uses these terms. For an example of the 'philodramatist' position see Trendall and Webster (1971), the title of which (*Illustrations of Greek Drama*) somewhat begs the question. One of the strongest cases for the 'iconocentric' argument is made by Small (2003) and has been described, perhaps unfairly, by Csapo (2010a) 1 as 'a kind of blunderbuss deconstruction of every possible link between the plastic arts and other forms of cultural expression'. Coo (2013) has recently demonstrated that in at least one early fourth-century depiction of the myth of Orestes at the tomb of Agamemnon (Taplin (2007) 50 no. 1) a painter did have several texts of tragedy in mind. A companion of Electra is labelled *ΙΣΜ[ΗΝΗ]*, which suggests a confusion between Sophocles' *Electra* and *Antigone*, on an image that recalls Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers*.

¹³⁷ Cleveland 1991.1 = LIMC VI 391–2 'Medeia' no. 36. See Sourvinou-Inwood (1997) 269–72; Revermann (2005); (2010) 73–90; Taplin (2007) 123 no. 35.

¹³⁸ LIMC VII 866–7 'Telephus' no. 59; See Taplin (2007) 207 no. 76.

¹³⁹ Policoro 35296 = LCS 58, 286 = MTS² no. LV5 (519) p. 129; see Trendall and Webster (1971) 96; Trendall (1989) no. 28 p. 22; Taplin (2007), 117–20 no. 34.

iconographic record before 431, the date of Euripides' play.¹⁴⁰ On a pelike of roughly the same date, the same artist has depicted the binding of Dirce to a bull: an event narrated in Euripides' *Antiope*.¹⁴¹ A third vase, an early Lucanian pelike possibly by the Carnea painter, appears to evoke the opening scene of the *Heracidae*.¹⁴² Although these scenes do not exactly correspond to the texts in every detail, the impact of Euripides' plays on the artistic imagination of Lucanian vase painters is evident, and within only few years of the poet's death.¹⁴³ And as Taplin has suggested, 'the [Policoro] vases add up to a good case for the activity of performances of tragedy... in Heraclea before 390 BC, maybe even within Euripides' lifetime.'¹⁴⁴

Another Lucanian vase painting has been plausibly linked to the *Aeolus* and may suggest that the play was indeed known in southern Italy while Euripides was still alive.¹⁴⁵ This was found not at Policoro but at Canosa in Apulia and is attributed to the Amykos painter. The vessel, however, dates from around 410 and is thus one of the earliest images inspired by tragedy to come from the Greek West. Taplin has expressed surprise that 'such a scandalous play... made enough impact to be reflected on a vase within twenty years of its first performance in Athens.'¹⁴⁶ He notes the localization of the Aeolian Islands but also the distance between those isles and Lucania, where the vase was made. Yet if *Aeolus* was seen as a common ancestor of the Western Greeks, a performance in Lucania would be perfectly

¹⁴⁰ Before Euripides other episodes from Medea's life are more common, such as the deception of the Peliades, e.g. London E163 = ARV² 258.26, Berlin 2188 = ARV² 297.1: early fifth-century Attic vases showing the rejuvenation of a ram by Medea. For a detailed survey of images related to the Medea myth, see Sourvinou-Inwood (1997) 262–9.

¹⁴¹ Policoro 35297 = LCS 58, 288 = MTS² no. LV7 (521) p. 130. Trendall and Webster (1971) 82–3; Trendall (1989) no. 29 p. 22; Taplin (1998) 33–4, cf. (2007) 187–8; Allan (2001) 72.

¹⁴² Policoro 35302 = LCS 55, 283 = MTS² no. LV6 (520) p. 130 = LIMC IV 725 'Heracidae' no. 2; see Trendall and Webster (1971) 86; Wiles (1997) 192; Allan (2001) 75–6; Taplin (2007) 127 no. 37. Another early Lucanian vase of the same date shows the later scene in the play (55–119) in which the herald attempts to remove Iolaus by force: Berlin 1969.6 = LCS Suppl. II 158, 291a = LIMC no. 3 = Taplin (2007) 129 no. 38.

¹⁴³ Cf. Trendall (1989) 22, who believed the Policoro Dirce and Medea were works commissioned by a particularly avid enthusiast for the works of Euripides, perhaps even an actor. On inconsistencies with the texts, see Small (2003) 47–52; (2005) 106–9.

¹⁴⁴ Taplin (2012) 236.

¹⁴⁵ Bari 1535 = LIMC I.398–99 'Aiolos' = Taplin (2007) 168–9 no. 56.

¹⁴⁶ Taplin (2007) 169.

natural, especially if it were combined with the *Captive Melanippe*, a play with definite links to Metapontum and Siris/Heraclea. If so, like Aeschylus' *Persians* and perhaps also Euripides' *Archelaus*, the plays may have been staged both at the Athenian Dionysia and at festivals outside Attica.

Although the Lucanian vases all date from the last decade of the fifth century, none of the plays represented are from the final years of Euripides' life. The *Medea*, *Telephus*, and *Heraclidae* all date from the 430s, allowing a gap of at least thirty years for the plays to have reached the Greek West. The possible exception is *Antiope*, which is dated by the scholion on Aristophanes' *Frogs* to the final decade of the fifth century. However, the metrical data points to a date as early as 425 BC, roughly comparable with *Aeolus*, and some have argued that the scholiast has confused this play with Euripides' *Antigone*.¹⁴⁷ The painters' choice of subject matter may thus suggest that it took some time for individual tragedies to make an impact on visual culture.

Such a time-lag between the date of a work's composition and the point at which its influence may be first observed in the iconographic record is far from uncommon. We possess not a single image that can be securely linked to the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* before the fifth century, yet it is inconceivable that these texts were not disseminated in the archaic period.¹⁴⁸ More importantly, there are very few Attic vase paintings from the fifth century that suggest the influence of specific tragedies. The earliest images—at least one depiction of the meeting of Orestes and Electra possibly linked to the *Libation Bearers* and five depictions of the start of the *Eumenides*—appear between ten and twenty years after the first production of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*.¹⁴⁹ Taplin has argued that the depiction of tragedy was a Western Greek

¹⁴⁷ Σ Ar. *Ran.* 53a (Holwerda III 1a p. 12). See Cropp and Fick (1985) 75–6; Luppe (1992) 97–8; Jouan and Van Looy (1998) 220–1; Collard, Cropp, and Gibert (2004) 269.

¹⁴⁸ See Lowenstam (1997); Snodgrass (1998); Small (2003) 8–36.

¹⁴⁹ *Libation Bearers*: Copenhagen 597 = ARV² 1301.5 = LIMC III 713 'Electra' no. 34; see Trendall and Webster (1971) 41; Prag (1985) 54. This scene also appears on a series of stone reliefs from Melos that are of a similar date; see MTS² YT p.138. A similar example by the Jena Painter dates to c.380 BC (Exeter University; ARV² 1516.80). *Eumenides*: See MTS² pp. 140–1; Prag (1985) 48–51; Taplin (2007) 59. (1) London BM 1923.10–16.10 = ARV² 1112.5 = LIMC VII 71 'Orestes' no.8; see Trendall and Webster (1971) 45. (2) Berlin 2380 = ARV² 1121.16 = LIMC VII 71 'Orestes' no.7. (3) Syracuse 41621 = ARV² 1115.31 = LIMC VII 71 'Orestes' no. 9. (4) San Antonio 86.134.73 = ARV² 1097.21 = LIMC VII 71 'Orestes' no. 10. (5) Louvre K343 = ARV² 1117.7 = LIMC VII 71 'Orestes' no. 22.

innovation.¹⁵⁰ Yet Athenian vase painters had been producing images of theatrical performances (as opposed to mythical scenes inspired by tragedy) from the start of the fifth century.¹⁵¹ In addition, the fifth-century Attic images echoing the *Oresteia* show strong parallels both with Aeschylus' text and the later fourth-century works produced in the Greek West.¹⁵² A more plausible explanation is that texts are only likely to impact on artistic conventions once they have become canonical. The representation in art of scenes from works of literature thus represents the end of a process of dissemination, not its beginning. If so, the dissemination of Euripides' early plays in southern Italy, and specifically the region around Heraclea and Metapontum, may have been a gradual process, potentially spanning up to three decades prior to the creation of the Policoro vases. This could have been achieved either through the presence of Western Greeks at the Athenian Dionysia, the circulation of texts, or even actual performance in Italy itself.

We have seen that *Captive Melanippe* and *Aeolus* were two plays that could easily have appealed to a variety of audiences in the Greek West, in particular the Greek populace of Metapontum, Heraclea, and the Aeolian islands. We also have evidence that a number of Euripides' early plays, including the *Aeolus*, were known in the West by the end of the fifth century at the latest. It is also clear that Euripides staged plays outside Athens: the *Andromache* after around

¹⁵⁰ Taplin (2007) 33. Cf. Robert (1881) 28, 129–48 who was also sceptical of a link between Attic vase painting and tragedy.

¹⁵¹ e.g. Basel BS 415 (a possible image of a tragic chorus in performance); see C–S 57; Green (1991b) 34–7; Taplin (1997) 70 and (2007) 29; Froning (2002) 72.

¹⁵² See Prag (1985) 48 who argues for a 'sudden and clearly defined change', taking place in Attic vase painting 'immediately after the first production of Aeschylus' *Oresteia*'. The dress of the Erinyes in these vases, short knee-length chitons, is quite extraordinary for women, yet corresponds closely to the description given by Orestes in the *Libation Bearers* (φαυχίτροες Aesch. *Cho.* 1048; cf. Prag (1985) 49). The tomb, offerings, Electra and Orestes and Pylades all appear in southern Italian vase painting from around 380, e.g. Syracuse 36334 = LCS 203.26: a Sicilian calyx crater by the Dirce painter; see Trendall and Webster (1971) 42–4. Giuliani (2001) somewhat overstates the dependence of Western vase paintings on the texts, when compared with the Attic examples. An Italian vase dated to around 370 (Naples 3249 (inv. 82270) = *RVAp* 167, 13 = *LIMC* VII.72 'Orestes' no.12) closely parallels the Attic depictions of the *Eumenides*, in both showing the influence of the text and simultaneously diverging from it. On the left of Orestes stands Artemis, who plays no role in Aeschylus' version. Yet she appears in one of the fifth-century Attic depictions of this scene, where Giuliani treated her presence as a 'contraindication' against the vase's connection to the tragedy (Berlin 2380 = *ARV²* 1121.16; Giuliani (2001) 28).

425 and the *Archelaus* sometime between 413 and 407/6. Sicily had provided Aeschylus with ample opportunities for performance; might a tour of the Greek West have seemed an equally enticing prospect to Euripides in around 420? Ultimately the precise details regarding this process of dissemination elude us. We do not know for certain whether Euripides himself intended for his plays to be produced abroad or whether other individuals were responsible for bringing texts, or even reports of performances, from Athens.¹⁵³ One thing, though, is certain: Euripides was indeed, in the words of his biographer, most beloved of strangers (ξενοφιλότατος).¹⁵⁴

CONCLUSION

The second half of the fifth century is often thought of as a time of radical change and upheaval. According to the traditional view, it is now that tragedy truly began to be exported abroad. Yet the evidence in fact suggests a pattern of continuity from earlier periods. A new market for tragedy may have opened in Macedonia by the final decade of the century, but it is likely that the connections between the Greek mainland and the Greek West were just as strong as they had been in the days of Aeschylus. Drama was produced in similar contexts, if in different locations: at Dion we have a festival funded by a wealthy ruler, probably not dissimilar from those held by Archelaus' predecessors in Sicily. Once again a coterie of famous poets drawn from across Greece appears at the tyrant's door.

The tragedies produced by Euripides in this period explore familiar themes. *Archelaus*, *Andromache*, and *Captive Melanippe* all tell the story of the foundation of a city or dynasty. Yet they do more than narrate a parochial aetiological myth: they link a community on what we might describe as the periphery of the Greek world with some of the most famous kings of the heroic age. These are Heracles, Achilles, and Hellen respectively. The first of these heroes was of crucial

¹⁵³ Plutarch's story that Athenian prisoners in Syracuse who could recite the lyrics of Euripides received better treatment from their captors may be relevant here (*Nic.* 29).

¹⁵⁴ διὸ καὶ ξενοφιλότατον κεκλησθαί φασι διὰ τὸ μάλιστα ὑπὸ ξένων φιλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ γὰρ Ἀθηναίων ἐφθονεῖτο, *Vit.* III.4 TrGF= Hermippus fr. 94 Wehrli.

importance since it enabled the Macedonians to define themselves as Greeks and to articulate their place within the wider Greek community. It is possible that the last two fulfilled a similar role in Epirus and Italy respectively. Hellen is the archetypical founding hero, since it is from him that all the branches of the Greek nation are descended. The Italian Aeolus, a descendant of Hellen, is himself the ancestor of smaller groups of Greeks in the West. However far the Greeks spread, they could always work their way back through the genealogies to draw links between themselves and their fellow Hellenes. These connections are themselves created by the mythical travels of heroes. One of the functions of tragedy in the second half of the fifth century was to refashion and retell these very myths.

Tragedy outside Attica c.400–300 BC

INTRODUCTION

The process of tragedy's dissemination has often been described as an export from one centre of origin (Athens) outwards towards a periphery. Individual plays, according to the traditional view, are developed in Athens and then spread abroad. I have argued in the previous chapters that this process was more complex and should be viewed in terms of continuous interaction within a network of centres. From the late sixth to the late fifth century, tragedy both emerged from and was part of a longstanding Panhellenic song culture. As such, the process of tragedy's dissemination occurred simultaneously with its development. This dissemination can be seen in two ways: the first is the initial production and performance of a play within a Panhellenic centre and to a Panhellenic audience. Some of the earliest tragedies were composed by poets from outside Attica; the audiences of many, if not most, of these early tragic performances would have likewise included non-Athenians. The second involves continuous movement of audience members, performers and texts between such centres. The early tragedians travelled to perform and, in doing so, worked alongside or in competition with poets specializing in other genres. It is thus that Pindar of Thebes and Aeschylus appear both in Athens and also Syracuse, the home of Doric comedy. While poetic traditions may have been distinct, they did not exist in isolation.

How does this process continue in the fourth century? There is an increase in the number and variety of opportunities for staging drama across the Greek world.¹ We begin to have better evidence

¹ Expansion: Easterling (1993) 563 and 569 who points to a 'new kind of cosmopolitan sensibility' in theatre as a factor for change; cf. Easterling (2002) 331, where

for performances of tragedy outside Athens, while being less well informed regarding the content of the plays performed. Perhaps unsurprisingly, therefore, scholars have tended to differentiate the popular 'international' theatre of the fourth century from 'Athenian' political drama of the fifth. According to this argument, the dissemination of tragedy, though foreshadowed by the travels of Aeschylus and Euripides, happens relatively suddenly and relatively quickly between the late fifth and mid fourth centuries.² Those who see tragedy's dissemination as a radical departure largely confined to the fourth century tend to link this widening of tragedy's audience with a substantial change in its form and function.³ As Hall has argued, tragedy in around 380 was 'qualitatively different' from what it had been in 430.⁴ The unacknowledged advantage of such a period of transition is that it neatly separates the original Attic tragedy from later Greek tragedy.

This view of tragedy's transformation is to some extent a metastasized version of a longstanding narrative of fourth century decline and decadence. Stretching back to Nietzsche and beyond, the 'death of tragedy' has proved one of the most fundamental and enduring assumptions in the history of scholarship on ancient drama.⁵ Its main

she notes the 'development of a competitive market for touring performers' during the fourth century. Micheleni (1999–2000) speaks of 'the fourth century's focus on private relations and Panhellenic masses'; cf. C–S 223–4 and Csapo (2010a) 103–4 who argues that opportunities for actors doubled at the end of the fifth century. Aneziri (2009) 217 states that there was 'an explosion in festival culture that took place at the beginning of the Hellenistic period'. On new festivals see Parker (2004). On theatre numbers see Frederiksen (2002) 69–76.

² e.g. most recently Vahtikari (2014) 208: 'the spread of theatre (on a wider scale) began around 400 BC. Strictly speaking, the spread was initiated with Aeschylus' first visit to Sicily in c. 470, but the process must have taken place gradually.'

³ e.g. Kaimio (1999) 45 has claimed that 'in the cultural environment which... developed [from the fourth century] the social function of theatre was naturally different from that found in the fifth-century city state of Athens.'; cf. E. Hall (2007b) 278 argues that tragedy became less 'Athenocentric' but not less political between 430 and 380 BC. See Ceccarelli (2010) 146 on the supposed 'death' of theatre and the *polis*; *contra*: Le Guen (1995); (2001) II 9–11.

⁴ E. Hall (2007b) 269.

⁵ Nietzsche (1872); see Csapo (2014) 1–3 for a recent discussion and bibliography. This narrative was rejected by Easterling (1993) and Le Guen (1995); (2001) II 9–11; yet it continues to appear even in comparatively recent scholarship, e.g. Junker (2011) 147 suggests that late fifth-century vase painting provides a 'testimony to and symptom of a great change or even a crisis in Athenian theatre culture'. The addition of 'a great change' provides a slight qualification to what Ghiron Bistagne (1974) had termed 'die Krise des Theaters', but otherwise we have not advanced very far.

elements are as follows: it is alleged that the early symptoms of this decline can be detected even in the last plays of Euripides and that the trend was only exacerbated by the defeat of Athens in 404.⁶ By the fourth century tragedians have generally become panderers to mass (and increasingly international) audiences, employing new musical techniques, melodramatic plots, and rhetorical effects to draw in the crowds.⁷

Yet drama in the fourth century and Hellenistic period cannot be said to have declined in terms of popularity, in the number of performances, or even the number of poets. On the contrary, the available evidence suggests substantial growth. Since we possess not a single play intact, a negative assessment of the quality of later tragedy must rely largely on the assumption that their loss was due to some perceived inferiority. Such an assumption is far from justifiable. It is more than likely that the creation of the tragic canon, though instrumental in preserving the works of the three great tragedians, had the negative result of banishing into obscurity those excluded from it. On the evidence of the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel, the only play from the third or second century from which substantial fragments survive, we can at least say that its author was both competent and well versed in earlier tragedy, especially the works of Aeschylus.⁸ Aristotle viewed his contemporaries Astydamos and Theodectas highly enough for him to draw examples from their plays in his discussion of tragedy.⁹ The influence of the *Hector* by Astydamos

⁶ Nietzsche (1872) ch. 11: 'Diesen Todeskampf der Tragödie kämpfte Euripides'. For recent discussions on the role of Euripides in this decline see e.g. Gregory (2005b) 252–6; Gakopoulou (2012); and the studies assembled by Markantonatos and Zimmermann (2012). For the decline of serious theatre as a result of Athens' defeat in the Peloponnesian War see Kolb (1979) 516–17; Xanthakis-Karamanos (1980) 3–5; Schwartz (1986) 185; and Kuch (1993) 547.

⁷ e.g. Gentili (1979) 22 characterizes later theatre as 'a theatre of entertainment, largely expressionist and concerned above all with musical *mimesis* . . . [and one which had] assumed forms and functions quite different from its original ones of the fifth century'. Cf. Kuch (1993) 547 and 550: 'in the fourth century a fundamental functional change occurred in the tragic genre. . . . Fourth century tragedy had obviously more the intention to entertain . . . than promote self-understanding according to the standards of the fifth century *polis* democracy.' On rhetoric in fourth-century tragedy see Xanthakis Karamanos (1979). *Contra*: Webster (1954), who denied that the fourth century was a period of decline, while admitting that fourth-century drama was characterized by its derivative nature and interest in rhetoric.

⁸ See Jacobson (1983) 23–7.

⁹ Theodectas: *Poet.* 1455b29, 1455b4; Astydamos: 1453b29–33, 1454a2–4; see Hanink (2014) 200–3.

has been detected on a south Italian vase painting dating from the 330s.¹⁰

Yet while a 'decline' seems increasingly unlikely, scholars are still willing to see a 'change', positive or neutral, in the form and meaning of theatrical performance in the fourth century. The major difference between the narrative of decline and that of change is that the proponents of the latter view tend to present the new theatre in a more positive light than their predecessors. The idea of a fundamental break with the past remains attractive, however, because it provides a convenient explanation for the relatively sudden export of tragedy. The purpose of this chapter is to reconsider this assumption: did the fourth century give rise to a period of radical change or an accelerated continuation of the earlier process of dissemination? In what follows we will seek to define the nature of any change as one more of scale rather than essence.

1. A NEW ERA?

a. The Death of Political Tragedy?

According to the traditional view, fifth century tragedy played a role within the Athenian democracy that could not be replicated exactly elsewhere. At some point the *polis* of Athens lost its hold over the theatre in the crisis of the fourth century.¹¹ Such a trend is often linked to the 'internationalization' of tragedy. Xanthakis-Karamanos, for example, has claimed that

the broadening outlook of tragedy at the end of the fifth century, [foreshadows] the transition from the "theatre of the city-state" to a theatre that is more panhellenic in orientation... Later Euripidean plays, such as *Archelaus* and *Iphigenia in Aulis*, seem to anticipate the mood of the later changeful period, the period of transition from polis-based identification to a wider consciousness of Hellenic identity.¹²

¹⁰ Taplin (2007) no. 101, 253–4; (2009).

¹¹ 'Die Krise des Theaters ist vor allem durch das Zurücktreten der Polis als Quell der Inspiration gekennzeichnet', Ghiron-Bistagne (1974) 1348.

¹² Xanthakis-Karamanos (2012) 110.

Relatedly, Hall has suggested that a broader audience caused tragedy to lose its political element: ‘it became inappropriate for its content to be so explicitly designed to glorify Athens.’¹³

Aristotle’s *Poetics* is often cited as an example of this emerging trend. The work contains no acknowledgement of tragedy’s existence as, what Hall calls, ‘a document of the Athenian civic imagination’; indeed he expressly views poetic and political skill as having distinct aims.¹⁴ How could Aristotle have been ignorant of such a defining characteristic of tragedy, unless, we are told, tragedy had changed significantly by the fourth century?¹⁵ Aristotle is thus thought to typify the new audience of tragedy: non-Athenian with no interest in democratic politics, believing instead in the primary importance of plot and aesthetic quality.

Yet Aristotle is unlikely to have been ignorant of any aspect of fifth-century tragedy known to modern scholars: he possessed more texts and would have had the opportunity to see them re-performed at Athens and elsewhere. It could at least be argued that Aristotle deliberately decided to ignore certain elements that did not fit with his view of poetry.¹⁶ The absence of ‘Athenianness’ in Aristotle’s account of tragedy does not rule out an ‘Athenocentric’ interpretation; but neither does it prove that his account was unrepresentative of the views of his contemporaries or predecessors. In fact, as Heath has argued, the assumption that tragedy played a political function within the Athenian state, and moreover that this function was viewed by contemporaries as fundamental to the understanding of

¹³ E. Hall (2007b) 278.

¹⁴ E. Hall (1996b) 297; she quotes (p. 295) Arist. *Poet.* 1460b13–15: πρὸς δὲ τούτοις οὐχ ἡ αὐτὴ ὁρβότης ἐστὶν τῆς πολιτικῆς καὶ τῆς ποιητικῆς οὐδὲ ἄλλης τέχνης καὶ ποιητικῆς. Heath (2009) 469 argues that Aristotle means ‘not that [tragedy and politics] are not connected but that they are not co-extensive’. Tragedy, like politics, dealt with ethics but it had its own sphere of competence.

¹⁵ See E. Hall (1996b); Wise (2008); Griffith and Carter (2011) 5; Hanink (2011) 321–3. See also Deper (2007) 146–7 who argues that Aristotle disassociated tragedy from its origins in civic ritual.

¹⁶ E. Hall (1996b) 298–9 makes the case that he betrays elsewhere an awareness of the importance of an Athenian social context that is suppressed in the *Poetics*. She cites, for example, *Politics* 1276b4–7, where Aristotle notes that a chorus can be employed in either tragedy or comedy without changing its members. The example is then used to illustrate how a state can change government without altering it *in toto*. However, in this comparison a chorus is only like a government in this one way; it does not follow that Aristotle, or potentially anyone else, would be expected to understand a chorus to be political.

the genre, is by no means as safe as Hall would like.¹⁷ Fifth-century sources that describe tragedy as both political and Athenian are hard to find. It is easy to demonstrate that the Greeks believed poetry could be of use in training citizens or in guiding their deliberations; yet this was not a new idea in the fifth century and it was not thought to apply to Athens and tragedy alone.¹⁸ The itinerant, and largely non-Athenian, sophists of the fifth century were capable of making the same argument regarding their own writings and teachings (cf. *Pl. Prot.* 319a3-4). The texts of tragedy themselves offer little support to Hall's case. Given that plays directly concerning Athens or Athenians represented only a small proportion of classical tragedies, it is perhaps understandable if Aristotle neglects to discuss these in detail in what is a relatively brief essay. Had our knowledge of ancient drama rested entirely on books written in the last fifty years such omissions might have seemed more remarkable.¹⁹

Ceccarelli has made a similar case based on the epigraphical evidence for fourth-century and later performances of tragedy. While the tragic competitions of the Dionysia were the occasion of choice for the announcement of civic honours at Athens, this was not always so in later festivals outside Attica. She concludes that at Athens the tragic contests were chosen 'because of the civic value of the performance to follow' and that the changes that took place outside Attica in the Hellenistic period are indicative of a time when the city and tragedy 'went their separate ways'.²⁰ Yet this runs the risk of becoming a circular argument, since the case for tragedy's 'civic value' has tended to rely on the 'frame' of civic events, including the practice of granting honours in the theatre.²¹ In any case, it is uncertain

¹⁷ Heath (2009) 472-3.

¹⁸ Compare, for example, the claim of 'Euripides' (*Ar. Ran.* 1009-10) that poets are praised for improving men in the cities (note the plural) with the public benefits advertised by Xenophanes (fr. 2.11-20 West).

¹⁹ Griffith in Griffith and Carter (2011) 5-6 asks the question: 'Was Aristotle simply wrong to ignore so utterly the "Athenianness" of tragedy and the democratic (and religious) aspects of Attic drama in general? Do we know better than he?' The conclusion: 'Yes: I should say that Aristotle was indeed "wrong" (or over reticent).' The main rationale for this view, however, is that 'it would seem silly, indeed, for anyone nowadays to seek to undo or contradict the scholarly efforts of the last few decades'.

²⁰ Ceccarelli (2010) 146.

²¹ For the contrast between tragedy and the dominant ideology articulated by the pre-play ceremonies, including the granting of honours, see Goldhill (1987)

whether crowns were awarded to citizens at the fifth-century Athenian Dionysia and they are relatively uncommon in the classical period as a whole.²² On the other hand, Ceccarelli lists several instances in which honours were granted at tragic competitions outside Attica during the fourth and third centuries.²³ The key consideration for selecting a venue is likely to have been the need to publicize the honours to a large gathering of citizens and visitors, rather than the precise form of the contest that would follow. A choral or athletic competition may have served this function as well as any other.

As Le Guen has argued, if the ‘death of theatre’ in the fourth century is one fallacy, the ‘death of the city’ is another.²⁴ Cities were already making and enforcing contracts with performers by the middle of the fourth century. When the tragic actor Aristodemus was appointed to Philocrates’ embassy to Philip in 346, messengers were sent to the cities (ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις, Aeschin. 2.19.4) that had hired Aristodemus to persuade them to waive the fines incurred for breach of contract. The details of a similar contract are preserved on an Euboean inscription dating to between 294 and 287 BC.²⁵ Four Euboean polities—Collytus, Eretria, Oreus, and Chalcis—come together to recruit artists (τεχνῖται) to appear in the Dionysia and Demetreia festivals celebrated in each city. On occasion cities had to negotiate hard to secure the best talent: in 305 Samos honoured the

62–3 = Goldhill in Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) 104–5. On crowns and honours see Wilson and Hartwig (2009) 22–3, who provide a full list of testimonia.

²² Carter (2004) 9 argues there is no evidence for the presentation of crowns to citizens in the fifth century. Even in the fourth century, it was arguably unconstitutional to award a citizen a crown in the theatre: see Dem. 18.120; Aeschin. 3.32–48, 153–4. Wilson (2009a), however, has given support to Goldhill’s idea of an ideological ‘frame’ by citing a small number of late fifth-century inscriptions that detail the award of honours in the theatre to non-Athenians in the late fifth century: in particular see *IG* I³ 102 and 125; *IG* II–III² 20. Rhodes (2011), on the other hand, notes that these inscriptions do not specifically celebrate democracy. The one exception is the inscription detailing the honours due to Thrasybulus for aiding in the restoration of the democracy (*IG* I³ 102). The award of these honours, however, was an unusual occasion and, as Rhodes notes (p. 74), ‘there is no evidence that the Dionysia was specifically and consciously democratic in other years’.

²³ Samos: *IG* XII/6.1.11.56–7; Tenos: *IG* XII/5.798.13–14, 800.8–10; *SEG* XL.688.12–14; Ceccarelli (2010) 124–7. See also on Samos *IG* XII/6.1.56.28–9 and for the third-century Ptolemeia on Delos *IG* XI/4.1043.13–16.

²⁴ Le Guen (1995).

²⁵ *IG* XII/9.207 = Le Guen (2001) I 41–56 no. 1; for a discussion of the calendar of festivals see Le Guen (2001) I 54.

star actor Polus for agreeing to appear for a reduced rate.²⁶ Even after the development of the 'guilds' of artists, cities tended to play the main role in the organization of dramatic festivals and the negotiation of the terms by which artists would perform.²⁷ In a mid-second century decree the association of Ionia and the Hellespont agree to send artists, including two tragedians, to enable the people of Iasos to hold their Dionysia. They do this out of consideration for the fact that the city has always upheld the privileges of the association.²⁸

The lengths to which cities went to secure the attendance of artists suggest that they had a strong interest in maintaining the reputation of their festivals. Le Guen notes a second century decree made after the inauguration of the festival of Leucophryena at Magnesia on the Maeander, in which the guild of artists declared their continuing ambition to augment the honour and standing of the city.²⁹ Festivals remained important sources of civic pride and cities continued to have a stake in securing the best talent for their competitions. As Athens had honoured Pindar in the fifth century, so cities in the Hellenistic period undertook to recognize those poets who produced suitably flattering works or significant performances. Such a reward, including a crown and appointment to the status of *proxenos*, was granted by Samothrace to the tragic poet Dymas at the end of the third century.³⁰ Rutherford has suggested that Dymas' performances may have played a role in diplomatic exchanges between Samothrace and his native city of Iasos.³¹ By the end of the fourth century, cities and sanctuaries were using festivals to advertise their political allegiances within the empires of the successors, as shown by the creation of the Antigoneia, Demetreia, and later Ptolemeia at Delos, among other examples.³²

There is equally little to suggest that later tragedy, once removed from the theatre of Dionysus at Athens, became a more secular form

²⁶ IG XII/6.56.9–14 = SEG I.362.

²⁷ See Aneziri (2003) 283–5; (2007).

²⁸ *I Iasos* 152 = Le Guen (2001) I 265–70 no. 53: l. 5 τη]ροῦντες δὲ καὶ τὰ δεδο[μένα τίμια τῷ κο]ινῷ τῶν περὶ τὸν Διόνυσον τεχνίτων ὑπὸ | [τῶν Ἑλλή]νων. On the Dionysia at Iasos see Crowther (2007).

²⁹ συναύξειν τὰ τίμια καὶ ἐνδοξα τῇ πόλει τῇ Μαγνήτων, *I Magn* 89.27–9 = Aneziri (2003) no. D9; Le Guen (1995) 82–3.

³⁰ *I Iasos* 153.

³¹ Rutherford (2007a) 282–6.

³² Antigoneia and Demetreia: IG XI/4.1036; Ptolemeia IG XI/4.1043; see Sifakis (1967) 15–17; Le Guen (2010b) 500–1, 505–8.

of entertainment.³³ As Lightfoot has noted, piety (εὐσεβεία) was of crucial importance in the self-representation of Hellenistic guilds.³⁴ The piety of the Athenian association was particularly noted by the Amphyctyonic council in a decree ratifying the privileges of the guild of either 279/8 or 278/7.³⁵ The embassy from the association to Delphi included a tragic poet Astydamas III (*TrGF* 96). Callixenes of Rhodes (*FGrHist* 627 F2 = Athen. 198b) reported that the tragic poet Philiscus of Corcyra (*TrGF* 104) led the τεχνῖται of Dionysus in a procession at Alexandria in 275/4 in his capacity as priest of Dionysus. Records of decrees honouring benefactors of the Alexandrine association were placed in front of the temple of Dionysus.³⁶

The dissemination of tragedy was neither the cause nor the effect of a depoliticization of tragedy. Tragedy was always political in the sense that the *polis* took a major interest in its performances and a stake in the organization of its festivals, on which it lavished substantial sums of money. The notion of a later apolitical theatre derives from a misconceived notion of the relationship between tragedy and politics in fifth-century Athens, one that has tended to characterize the genre as inward-looking and reflective of internal Athenian politics. This has led to a false dichotomy between the ‘theatre of the city-state’ and ‘Panhellenic theatre’. In reality, ‘Panhellenic theatre’ is merely a network of festivals organized and promoted by individual cities. It is the connections between these cities, fostered by the frequent movement of performers and spectators, that makes theatre Greek. This was as true for the fifth century as it was for subsequent epochs.

b. Specialization and Professionalization: The Rise of the Acting Profession?

The fourth century and Hellenistic period have frequently been characterized as an era that saw increased specialization and professionalism

³³ Cf. Sifakis (1967) 61 ‘drama was a development of Dionysiac rites in Attica, but at the time of its great expansion the Dionysiac character had become merely nominal.’

³⁴ Lightfoot (2002) 217–21.

³⁵ τὰς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσεβείας, *FD* III.2.68.89 = Le Guen (2001) I 57–61 no. 2 = Aneziri (2003) A5B.

³⁶ *OGIS* 50.11–12 = Le Guen (2001) I 293–6 no. 60.

among performers.³⁷ The most significant development is the growing importance of the acting profession and the emergence of international acting icons.³⁸ Actors began to be recognized as artists in their own right, especially for the realistic outpourings of emotion with which they moved the crowds.³⁹ The emergence of the acting profession has on occasion been presented either as the reason for, or a result of, tragedy's dissemination. In the words of Hall: 'tragedy [came] to be identified less with the poet than with the actor who could carry his masks to every *polis* that could accommodate his performance.'⁴⁰ In the view of at least one scholar, it is these professional actors who are largely to blame for causing Aristotle and his contemporaries to mistake 'a celebratory political art for a weepy and histrionic one'.⁴¹ At this point we need to consider whether an increase in specialization and professionalism actually took place in the fourth century. What do we mean by these terms and what form did they take? How radical was this development? And finally, can it be understood as either a cause or an effect of the dissemination of tragedy?

The number of specialist art-forms connected with music and the theatre certainly increases over time, though the concept of the specialist performer may not itself have been anything new. Chaniotis has listed as many as ninety three separate terms for members of the Hellenistic and Imperial guilds of the artists of Dionysus.⁴² To give one example, a mid-third century decree of the Alexandrine guild,

³⁷ See Ghiron-Bistagne (1974) 1339–41, 1348–57, who saw increased professionalism as a cause of 'die Krise des Theaters'; on specialization see Le Guen (1995) 87; Goldhill (1999) 23; Lightfoot (2002) 213–16; Kotlińska-Toma (2015) 1.

³⁸ e.g. Wise (2008) 397 'the rise of the celebrity actor was accompanied by significant changes in the nature of tragic competition'; cf. Csapo (2004a) 68–9, who sees the development of the art of acting as part of a late trend towards further professionalism in music in general. International actors: see Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 136: 'Au IV^e siècle, on voit surgir une génération d'artistes dont l'activité rayonne bien au-delà des limites de l'Attique. Certains deviennent de véritables "vedettes" internationales.' Cf. Easterling (2002) and Csapo (2010a) on acting 'icons'.

³⁹ On realism see Csapo (2002). On emotive acting styles see Wise (2008) 404–5. Ancient sources (e.g. Pl. *Leg.* 800d–e; Xen. *Symp.* 3.11) indicate that actors took pride in their ability to make an audience cry.

⁴⁰ E. Hall (2007b) 284. Cf. Easterling (1999) 164–5, who also links the emergence of the acting profession with the expansion of theatre and increased reperformance in the fourth century. She nevertheless questions whether 'actors [were not] merely the latest recruits in a tradition of travelling virtuosi [dating] back to the archaic period?' On actors and their role in the dissemination of tragedy in southern Italy, see Taplin (2012) 236–43.

⁴¹ Wise (2008) 384.

⁴² Chaniotis (1990) 99–102.

detailing honours bestowed on Lysimachus, the son of Ptolemy Philadelphus, provides us with a list of members.⁴³ They include tragic poets (τραγωδιῶν ποιηταί), comic poets (κωμωδιῶν ποιηταί), epic poets (ἐπῶν ποιηταί), a citharode (κιθαρωδός), cithara player (κιθαριστής), dancer (ὀρχηστής), tragic performers (τραγωδός, συναγωνιστὰ τραγικοί), comic performers (κωμωδοί), a chorus instructor ([χορ]οδιδάσκα[λος]), tragic aulos player (αὐλητὴς τραγικός), trumpeter (σαλπικτής), and 'set-designer' (σκευοποιός). In the case of the dancer, chorus instructor, trumpeter, and set-designer we have largely new specialisms. However, in at least one of these cases, that of the chorus-instructor, a new field of expertise has been created out of activities that were once seen as belonging to the overall province of the poet, the ultimate and original specialist.⁴⁴ This gradual process of technical speciation may date from before the classical period, since already in the fifth century there was little overlap between poets and performers of tragedy and comedy.⁴⁵ The division of music into separate arts of drama, aulos-playing, citharodia and epic is likely to reflect a distinction between contests that may date to the archaic period, and certainly to the classical.⁴⁶

Actors remain an interesting case of a specialism that emerged from obscurity in the late fifth and fourth centuries. We are referring here to a process of professionalization, by which an occupation comes to be recognized as the practice of a definable, teachable, and above all valuable skill. In practice there were always actors (performers distinct from the chorus) for as long as there was drama, yet the art of acting gained recognition as a profession only gradually over the course of the fifth and early fourth centuries. Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1403b) indicates that acting was only appreciated as a separate skill from that of the poet at a fairly late stage. This would seem to be confirmed by the comparatively late establishment in 449 of a prize for actors at Athens, alongside the award given to the

⁴³ OGIS 51.29–46 = Le Guen (2001) I 296–300 no. 61.

⁴⁴ On the role of chorus-instructors in the Hellenistic period see Sifakis (1967) 80–1, 116–20; Slater (1993) 194–5.

⁴⁵ See Sutton (1987); Csapo (2010a) 88–9; Stewart (2016a).

⁴⁶ Hdt. 5.67: contests of rhapsodes are replaced with 'tragic choruses'; Pl. *Ion* 530a: contest of rhapsody and other music (ἄλλης μουσικῆς) at the Asclepieia of Epidaurus is said to be taking place in the late fifth century, while the festival itself is known from the time of Pindar (*Nem.* 3.84, 5.52, *Isthm.* 8.68). Paus. 10.7.2–8 dates the institution of contests of citharodia, aulody and aulos-playing at Delphi to 586.

victorious poet.⁴⁷ An actor called Heraclides, who was victor in 447, was both the first recipient of the prize in 449 and the first actor to be named on any surviving inscription.⁴⁸

Even after the institution of the prize, the status of actors and interest in their talents increased only gradually. Though his satire of tragic poets is superbly detailed, Aristophanes makes only a few references to actors.⁴⁹ Other comedians may have paid them more attention, however. Mynniscus, who was well known in the second half of the fifth century, was mentioned by Plato Comicus, while Strattis made Mynniscus' younger contemporary Callipides the subject of a whole play.⁵⁰ Actors seldom make an appearance in the iconographic evidence from the fifth century.⁵¹ Although performers posing with masks before or after their appearance on stage were a popular subject, Csapo has argued that most, if not all, of these early depictions represent chorus-members.⁵² On the Pronomos vase, dated to around 400, we have perhaps our earliest certain depictions of actors: one is dressed as Heracles and another as Silenus, standing together to the right of the couch of Dionysus. A third may be standing with a

⁴⁷ See O'Connor (1908) 46–7; *DFA*² 104; C–S 226–7; *IRDF* p. 13.

⁴⁸ *IRDF* 2318.286 and 2325B.2; Stephanis 1074.

⁴⁹ ὑποκριτής, Ar. *Vesp.* 1279; τραγῳδός, *Thesm.* 391; see also the use of the term in *Wasps* 1498, 1505 describing the sons of Carcinus who were probably actors in their father's troupe (ὑποκριταὶ ὀξυφωνότατοι, Σ Tzetz. Ar. *Nub.* 1261a Holwerda IV 2 p. 663), see Stewart (2016a). On the terminology for actors see O'Connor 1–37; Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 115–25 and *DFA*² 127–36. Aristophanes referred to some known individual actors: e.g. Hagelochos, who mispronounced Eur. *Or.* 269 (Σ Ar. *Ran.* 303 Holwerda III 1a pp. 50–1), and Oeagrus (*Vesp.* 579). Cleidemedes, mentioned in *Frogs*, may have been one of Sophocles' actors (Σ *Ran.* 791 Holwerda III 1a p. 104–5); see C–S 226.

⁵⁰ Plato fr. 175 K–A; Strattis T1, fr. 11–12 K–A.

⁵¹ The marble 'Actors' relief' from the Piraeus (Athens NM 1500), which is dated to around 410, is perhaps the best example. Slater (1985) 333–40 and especially 339 interpreted this work as a representation of a troupe of three actors holding masks approaching a benefactor (cf. Froning (2002) 77, who prefers to see the relief as the private dedication of an acting family to Dionysus). However, Csapo (2010a) 22 notes the tympana and the identical costume of the men to support his assertion that these are in fact chorus members. The maenad also suggests that the seated figure is Dionysus. Comparison with other choregic dedications makes this identification almost certain, e.g. Cagliari 10918 is a dedication to Dionysus of c.360 BC, which originally featured a reclining Dionysus and seated female figure holding a tragic mask; see Csapo (2010b) 90–1. A similar arrangement is present on the Pronomos Vase, where a seated woman is depicted next to Dionysus and Ariadne. She has been identified as tragedy personified: E. Hall (2007a) 223–37; (2007b) 266–7; cf. Griffith (2010) 60 who favours Aphrodite.

⁵² See Csapo (2010a) 14–20; Csapo (2010b) 80–95.

mask to the left. Unlike all the other members of the cast, these figures are not named, but only referred to with the titles of the roles they play.⁵³ The same pattern is found in fifth-century choregic inscriptions, where the poet and sometimes even the chorus members are named without any mention of the actors.⁵⁴

By contrast, we do at least possess definite depictions of actors in the mid-fourth century.⁵⁵ The best example of such an image is a fragment of an Apulian vase from around 340 BC, which depicts a man in high boots and with a cloak and sword considering a mask of an older and bearded character.⁵⁶ For later generations it was the late fifth and fourth centuries that provided the names of those actors worthy of mention alongside the great poets. Plutarch sets late fifth- or fourth-century actors next to poets who accompany a personified tragedy:

τραγικοί δ' αὐτοῖς ὑποκριταὶ [καὶ] Νικόστρατοι καὶ Καλλιπίδαι καὶ Μηνίσκοι καὶ Θεόδωροι καὶ Πῶλοι συνίτωσαν, ὥσπερ γυναικὸς πολυτελοῦς τῆς τραγῳδίας κομμωταὶ καὶ διφροφόροι.

And let the tragic actors go with them [i.e. Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides], the Nicostratuses and Callipideses and Mynniscuses and Theodoruses and Poluses, like the dressers and chair-carriers of the sumptuous Lady Tragedy.

(*de Gloria Ath.* 348e)

To later writers these names were akin to Garrick or Irvine, Terry or Bernhardt: acting legends who defined for later generations the stage of their day. Two out of the five actors mentioned (Theodorus and Polus), however, were not active during the lifetimes of the great poets and only one, Mynniscus is likely to have performed before the institution of the actors' prize.

A gradual change in the status of actors can therefore be said to have taken place, starting in the second half of the fifth century. How radical was this development? The increasing prominence of lead actors may be connected with the increasing recognition of delivery

⁵³ Csapo (2010a) 21.

⁵⁴ A list of chorus members is given by IG I³ 969, an inscription probably commemorating a victory at the rural Dionysia; see Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 119–21; DFA² 361; Wilson (2000) 131–3; Csapo (2004a) 60.

⁵⁵ See Green (2002) 99–102. This is also true of comedy, where figurines of actors are common from the end of the fifth century; see Green (1994) 34–5.

⁵⁶ Würzburg H4600 (L832) = MTS² GV3 p.80; Small (2003) 60–1; Csapo (2010a) 75–6.

(ὀπóκρισις) as a specialist skill (τέχνη) proper to actors. The effective use of one's voice to mimic a character or stir emotion was the principal criterion on which audiences judged an actor.⁵⁷ It is tragedy as a whole and not delivery on its own that is described as a τέχνη by Aristophanes at the end of the fifth century, the main representative of which was the poet.⁵⁸ Yet it was the growing appreciation of delivery by audiences that increasingly made the actor a star performer in Aristotle's day.⁵⁹

This skill of delivery may have been seen originally as but one element of the art of the poet. Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1403b20–1404a) claims that delivery was originally a lesser poetic concern and that the first orators, such as Gorgias, made their speeches as poetic as possible following their example. But he adds that although delivery began with the poets, it was only fully developed later with the emergence of those men, the rhapsodes and actors, who made its study their principal business (1404a20–5). In fact he can claim, somewhat paradoxically, that delivery only made its appearance late in the day in tragedy (καὶ γὰρ εἰς τὴν τραγικὴν καὶ ῥαψωδιαν ὁπὲ παρήλθεν, 1403b22). Hence, his claim that it was the poets who first acted.⁶⁰ It is not, according to Aristotle, that delivery or actors played no part in earlier theatre: rather the 'professionalization' of acting was achieved once delivery came to be recognized as an independent field of expertise, with its own set of rules and acknowledged experts.

In addition to acting themselves, poets may also have played a role in the selection of actors and certainly determined their number. Ancient authors in general refer to poets being given or refused a chorus but not actors.⁶¹ Plato can envisage poets applying to the

⁵⁷ Pl. *Resp.* 586c; *Leg.* 817c; Arist. *Rhet.* 1404b20–5; Plut. *Dem.* 10; Diod. Sic. 15.7; see Easterling (1999); Sifakis (2002) 160–1. In later sources, fourth-century actors appear in anecdotes as experts at elocution who were even hired to coach orators: Plut. *Dem.* 7; [Plut.] *X. Orat.* 844f, 845a, 848b; Anon. *Rhet.* 6.

⁵⁸ *Ran.* 761; Lightfoot (2002) 209.

⁵⁹ μείζον δύνανται νῦν τῶν ποιητῶν οἱ ὑποκριταί, *Rhet.* 1403b33.

⁶⁰ *Rhet.* 1403b23. This statement is paralleled in later sources, such as the tradition that the first poet not to act was Sophocles (*Vit. Soph.* 4). Compare the story that Thespis is supposed to have invented tragedy by responding to the chorus in his own works, allegedly to give the chorus a breather (*Suda* θ 282; Diog. Laert. 3.56). Not only has he given his name to the acting profession, but Plutarch claims Solon saw him perform (Plut. *Sol.* 29). This is unlikely, however, given the date of Solon's archonship in 594/3 and unfortunately the historicity of these anecdotes is, in general, uncertain.

⁶¹ Cratinus fr. 17 K–A; Pl. *Resp.* 383d, *Leg.* 817d; Arist. *Poet.* 1449b.

archons for a chorus but setting up stages and bringing in the actors themselves.⁶² Aristotle claims that it was the poets who were responsible for increasing the number of actors as the genre developed, although it is not certain whether they, like Plato's imaginary playwrights, actually undertook to hire them.⁶³ The entry in the *Didascaliae* for 341 BC, however, shows that by this time, at least in Athens, acting troupes were not connected with one poet.⁶⁴ Instead each poet had a different protagonist for each of his plays. This may point to a growing appreciation of the importance of acting in deciding the outcome of the poets' competition. It also shows that in the fourth century acting protagonists were not to be treated as merely the unnamed assistants of the poets, but rather artists worthy of mention in their own right.

The principal result of the 'rise of the acting profession' may have been to see the lead actor, or protagonist, take an equal position to the poet as head performer. In at least some cases he was responsible for hiring his assistants. Aeschines is described as working under, and hiring himself out to, a number of different protagonists as third actor, including the great Theodorus and Aristodemus.⁶⁵ After 449 it was the protagonist alone who claimed the victory in the acting contest, regardless of the contributions made by the other actors, just as it was the poet who alone received recognition before the institution of the actors' prize. As Sifakis has argued, 'the protagonist

⁶² σκηνάς τε πήξαντας κατ' ἀγορὰν καὶ καλλιφώνους ὑποκριτὰς εἰσαγαγομένους, Pl. *Leg.* 817c; cf. *Resp.* 568c.

⁶³ *Poet.* 1449a 15–19; cf. later traditions on the relationship between poets and their actors: Ister believed that Sophocles wrote parts for specific actors (*Vit. Soph.* 6 = *FGrHist* 334 F 36); Thomas Magister (*Vit. Eur.* III.12 *TrGF*) describes Ctesiphon as Euripides' actor (see Kovacs (1990), who thinks it most plausible that he was an actor, for a discussion of the *testimonia*). *Vit. Aesch.* 15 provides the names of the two actors appointed by Aeschylus. Else (1945) 7 suggested that these men with the addition of Aeschylus formed the three-man cast of the *Oresteia*; for a more sceptical view see *DFA*² 132–3.

⁶⁴ *IRDF* 2320.1–17; cf. Ghiron-Bistagne (1976) 36–8; *DFA*² 93–4; C–S 228–9; *IRDF* p. 62. The Byzantine lexica suggest that actors were assigned to poets by lot: see Photius 293. 24–7 = Hesychius ν 286 = *Suda* ν 178.

⁶⁵ While Demosthenes alleges that Aeschines lived at the expense of the choregic system (2.199), he also claims that he hired himself out to a troupe of actors (ἀλλὰ μισθώσας σαυτὸν τοῖς βαρυστόνοις ἐπικαλουμένοις ἐκείνοις ὑποκριταῖς Σιμύκῃ καὶ Σωκράτει, ἐπιταγωνίστηκες 18.262). The protagonist may have supported his followers out of what the *chorēgos* provided him and a similar arrangement may have been followed when a poet was included in the troupe. Theodorus and Aristodemus: Dem. 19.246; cf. Demochares *FGrHist* 75 F 6a = *Vit. Aeschin.* 7; Stephanis 90; 332; 1157.

was recognized as the only player of a tragedy, as if he alone *acted the play* [his emphasis] while the other two actors, necessary though they were for the production of a play, assisted and (literally as well as metaphorically) worked for him.⁶⁶ Because actors wore masks and changed parts frequently it was difficult to differentiate between the protagonist and his two seconds. Sifakis notes that this is why the actor Theodorus never let any other actor go on stage before him:

οὐθενὶ γὰρ πώποτε παρήκεν ἑαυτοῦ προεισάγειν, οὐδὲ τῶν εὐτελῶν
ὑποκριτῶν, ὥς οἰκειουμένων τῶν θεατῶν ταῖς πρώταις ἀκοαῖς

He did not allow anyone to ever go out ahead of him, not even one of the lesser actors, as the viewers grow used to the voices they hear first.

(Arist. *Pol.* 1336b28–31)

The most important thing was for the audience to hear the protagonist first because the lead actor needed to be the main and most memorable voice in the whole troupe. The other actors were required to facilitate and enhance his performance. This further explains why the poets were unwilling to expand the acting troupes to a greater number than three.⁶⁷ Had they done so, the lead performer might have been completely lost in the expanded cast. While in the past tragedies were thought of as performances by the poet and his anonymous assistants, now the name and face of the troupe was that of the protagonist.

Theatre certainly became increasingly specialized in the fourth and third centuries, in the sense that the number of recognized specialisms increased. The increasing public recognition of the acting profession was undoubtedly a significant development. It may, however, have been less radical than is sometimes believed. When we talk of the growing importance of actors, what we mean is that protagonists came to be known and equally valued alongside poets. Delivery, originally one of the skills of the poet, became the acknowledged field of another specialist performer. In this sense, the art of the actor grew out of the art of the poet. As we shall see, actors certainly played a role in the dissemination of tragedy in the fourth century, but it was not a radically new one. It is probable that they were already travelling in

⁶⁶ Sifakis (1995) 16.

⁶⁷ Sifakis (1995); cf. C–S 222. Other suggested reasons include the expense of additional actors or the shortage of trained performers. See Knox (1972) 105–6 = (1979) 39–40.

the fifth, and in the company of poets. They would continue to do so throughout the remainder of the classical era and into the Hellenistic period.

c. Old Tragedy or New Tragedy?

The fourth century would see select dramas, dominated from an early period by the plays of Euripides, take their place at the centre of the Greek literary canon. To Aristotle (*Poet.* 1449a14–15), tragedy's development, a process observable in the works of the three great poets, had reached its natural conclusion before the end of the fifth century. But where does tragedy's dissemination fit into this process of later canonization? The development of the acting profession has on occasion been linked with the creation of a repertoire of old plays and the increasing reperformance of such fifth-century classics both in Athens and abroad. Hall has claimed that 'the formal institution of revivals led almost immediately to star actors emerging as the leaders of the internationalization of the tragic repertoire'.⁶⁸ One example of a travelling actor who specialized in old tragedy is provided by a second-century inscription from Tegea.⁶⁹ Among his most significant victories he mentions those at Athens with Euripides' *Orestes*, at the Delphic Soteria with the *Antaeus* of Arcestratus, at the Argive Heraea with Euripides' *Archelaus*, and at the Naia at Dodona, again with the *Archelaus* and also the *Achilles* by Chaeremon. This actor of old tragedy at least was a specialist in fifth-century, and specifically Euripidean, drama.

Did the creation of such a repertoire lead to or accelerate the dissemination of tragedy? Again the evidence would seem to point more to growth and continuity rather than radical change. As we have seen, reperformances of plays outside Athens were not unknown in the fifth century. In the case of the *Persians*, the initiative to reproduce the play in Sicily is likely to have come from Aeschylus. No other reperformance are recorded in our sources, though I have suggested that the *Archelaus*, *Aeolus*, and *Captive Melanippe* may have received multiple performances within Euripides' lifetime. Phrynichus

⁶⁸ E. Hall (2011) 61; cf. Csapo (2010a) 107 the institution of theatre revivals at Athens marks a watershed in the development of the acting profession.

⁶⁹ IG V.118.

was at least prohibited from reproducing his *Sack of Miletus*, while Aristophanes' claim that he produced *Clouds* in Athens first suggests an awareness that reperformance was possible.⁷⁰

On the other hand, the increasing importance of the tragic protagonist did not lead to a corresponding diminution in the role and prestige of the poet. Though the canon of old tragedy is likely to have provided important models for new works, the production of new tragedy continued apace. The fact that the plays of our second-century Tegean actor included the *Achilles* by the fourth-century tragedian Chaeremon suggests that later tragedy was not entirely excluded from the developing canon. Moreover, the fourth-century poets Antiphon, Carcinus II, and Theodectas are all believed to have been active outside Athens. By the Hellenistic period, some festivals, such as the Soteria at Delphi, may have dispensed with poetic competitions and in some cases poets are mentioned less frequently. However, contests of new tragedy are known to have taken place alongside those of old plays outside Athens. In the second century victor list for the festival of the Muses at Thespiae, the poets of new tragedy and comedy are listed after the performers of old drama, but ahead of their respective actors.⁷¹ Poets at the first century BC Serapieia at Tanagra are also known to have received crowns of greater value than actors of new drama, though less than the producer of old tragedy.⁷² Our account of the later dissemination of tragedy must therefore consider both the afterlife of fifth century tragedy and the ongoing production of new works, in which both poets and actors would play important roles.

d. Conclusion

The late fifth and fourth century saw tragic contests become more fully incorporated into the existing festival network and the tragic texts of Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides take their place in the

⁷⁰ See Appendix 3; Lamari (2015) and Finglass (2015) provide recent discussions on the reperformance of the plays of Aeschylus and Sophocles respectively. Note also the tradition, known to Dicaearchus (fr. 84 Wehrli), of a reperformance of Aristophanes' *Frogs*.

⁷¹ SEG III.334.

⁷² IG VII.540 = SEG XIX.335, XXV.501; see Slater (1993) 190; on the poet of new tragedy Asclepiades son of Hicesius see *TrGF* 140, Kotlińska-Toma (2015) 169.

Hellenic canon. However, if the ‘internationalization’ of tragedy was an event largely confined to the late fifth and fourth century (significant exceptions aside) then some explanation is required for its relatively sudden appearance. We have seen that there is little evidence for a ‘seismic shift in performance conditions’.⁷³ Indeed, it is not even clear whether such a change should be seen as a cause or effect of tragedy’s dissemination or why, moreover, it occurred in the first place. Even if such a change could have facilitated tragedy’s export, we are still at a loss to explain what motivated this export and what made it successful?

In the remainder of this chapter, I shall propose some solutions to these problems. It is suggested that the fourth century was primarily a period of growth rather than change: the time at which the developments that began in the fifth century came to be more fully realized within a continuous process of dissemination. This was itself the direct result of tragedy’s initial development as a genre within the broader song-culture and of the early efforts of the poets themselves. As we have seen, from its earliest conception tragedy was a form of Panhellenic performance intended for wide dissemination. What happens over time, therefore, is that cities and rulers gradually take the decision to invest in drama as a new form of Panhellenic display and, in many cases, to include it in existing competitions. It is not that tragedy is transformed from an Athenian to a Panhellenic genre, but rather that its advantages as a form of Panhellenic performance come increasingly to be recognized. To fully understand the tendency of fourth-century actors and poets to travel, we have to situate their wanderings within the context of a longstanding network.

2. THE DISSEMINATION OF TRAGEDY IN THE FOURTH CENTURY

a. Performance Venues

By the end of the fourth century we have much more detailed information than ever before regarding the location of dramatic festivals and sites of performance. Csapo and Wilson have recently

⁷³ E. Hall (2011) 61.

provided a comprehensive catalogue of cities where there is evidence for dramatic performance.⁷⁴ They list 116 locations that can plausibly be linked to drama, either through literary or inscriptional evidence or the presence of theatre remains. In the majority of cases, firm evidence for theatrical production is only available after 400 and the numbers continue to increase gradually down to the end of the century. The task now is to ask what factors informed the decision cities made to admit drama to their festivals.

One major reason suggested by Csapo and Wilson for the increase in sites connected with theatre in the fourth century is the influence of Athens. Although the allies were required to send delegations to the Dionysia from the fifth century, there is little evidence for dramatic performance in the Athenian empire before 400.⁷⁵ In the Aegean of the fourth century, we know of several Athenian allies and cleruchies that held dramatic festivals.⁷⁶ The Athenian *dēmos* settled at Myrina on Lemnos receive thanks from the Chalcidean community in the city for being allowed to purchase a plot of land, probably after the capture of their cities by Philip in 348. In addition, their representative is to be crowned at the tragic contest at the Dionysia.⁷⁷ An earlier inscription from before the Athenian settlement of Myrina in 394/3 mentions a grant of *prohedria* at contests held at public expense.⁷⁸ Unfortunately the precise nature of those contests is not made clear. If, as Csapo and Wilson have suggested, the Athenians in resettling the island ‘took their culture with them’, they may have been responsible for introducing drama into the existing festival culture.

To some extent, elements of the Athenian empire may have consciously adopted some of the rituals of the Dionysia. Csapo and Wilson cite the case of Rhodes as one example. After 395 a democracy was established on the island and in 378/7 Rhodes became part of the second Athenian confederacy. Fragments of an inscription discovered in Rome mention the victories of contemporary actors on Rhodes. They include Cleander, a tragic protagonist who was also a victor at the Athenian Dionysia in 387.⁷⁹ Diodorus Siculus mentions that during Demetrius’ siege of 305/4 the Rhodians instituted the practice of holding a parade of war-orphans in the theatre during

⁷⁴ Csapo and Wilson (2015).

⁷⁵ On delegations of allies see Ch. 3.1.

⁷⁶ Csapo and Wilson (2015) 354–7.

⁷⁷ τῷ ἀγῶνι τραγωδοῖς, IG XII/4.4.6.

⁷⁸ προε- | δρίαν ἐν τοῖς ἀγῶσιν τοῖς | δημοτελέσιν, IG XII/4.2.11–13.

⁷⁹ IGUR I.223; IRDF 2318.1008; Stephanis 1413.

the Dionysia.⁸⁰ Csapo and Wilson see this as an example of a city borrowing a ‘pre-play’ ceremony associated with the Athenian Dionysia.⁸¹ Another possible instance of an appropriation of Athenian customs is mentioned by Plutarch. In one of his accounts of a tragic contest held by Alexander at Tyre in 332, he notes that the Cypriot kings acted as *chorēgoi* ‘as those chosen by lot from among the tribes do at Athens’.⁸² It is not clear, however, whether this was a practice that had previously been adopted in Cyprus, or whether it was an innovation on the part of Alexander for his ad hoc contest at Tyre. Athenian influence may also have led to the foundation of a theatre on Thasos by the end of the fifth century, where the Athenian actor Theodorus seems to have appeared at a tragic contest sometime after 350.⁸³

While direct Athenian influence was certainly important, Csapo and Wilson acknowledge that it can answer only partially the question of why cities adopted the practice of holding tragic contests.⁸⁴ Athens does not seem to have actively attempted to export tragedy to its empire. A major anomaly is Delos, which seems to have possessed neither a theatre nor dramatic contests before gaining its independence from Athens in 314.⁸⁵ If the new tragic contests had a political function, it may have been to reassert Delos’ prominence as a cult centre, both within the League of Islanders and under the patronage of first Antigonos and then the Ptolemies.

Tragedy appears to have grown in popularity in areas outside the Athenian sphere of direct political influence. Although Dionysius of Syracuse’s decision to produce his play the *Ransom of Hector* at the Athenian Lenaea of 367 has plausibly been linked to the treaty ratified between Athens and Syracuse in the previous year, it is harder to link the longstanding enthusiasm for tragedy in the Greek West with Athenian policy.⁸⁶ As in the fifth century, Italy and Sicily were by no means dependent on Athenian imports of drama. In addition to Dionysius, ancient authors knew of tragedies ascribed to an Empedocles

⁸⁰ τοὺς δ’ υἱοὺς ἐν ἡλικίᾳ γενομένους ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ στεφανῶσαι τοῖς Διονυσίοις πανοπλίᾳ, Diod. Sic. 20.84.3.

⁸¹ Csapo and Wilson (2015) 356; for the orphans’ parade at Athens see Ch. 3 Introduction.

⁸² ὥσπερ Ἀθήνησιν οἱ κληρούμενοι κατὰ φυλάς, Plut. *Alex.* 29.2.

⁸³ IG XII Suppl. 400; Stephanis 1157; Csapo and Wilson (2015) 355.

⁸⁴ Csapo and Wilson (2015) 382.

⁸⁵ See Sifakis (1967) 15–17; Csapo and Wilson (2015) 357.

⁸⁶ See Ch. 3.2.a.

of Acragas, possibly the maternal grandson of the philosopher.⁸⁷ In the late fourth century the Italian Greek poet Rhinthon is said to have produced a new indigenous form of drama inspired by both tragedy and comedy, termed phlyax plays.⁸⁸ Theatres continued to be built throughout the fourth century. Diodorus dates the construction of the theatre in his home town of Agyrium—‘the finest in Sicily after that of the Syracusians’—to the period of prosperity following the overthrow of the tyrants by Timoleon of Corinth from 344.⁸⁹ The recently discovered theatre of Hippana at Monte dei Cavalli may also be part of a general increase in theatre building in Sicily after around 350.⁹⁰ In these cases, the construction of a theatre represented a prominent symbol of civic pride proper to an Hellenic city.

In many cases tragic contests were gradually incorporated into existing festivals held at major Panhellenic cult centres. From the fifth century, performances of tragedy and comedy, including works produced by Sophocles and Aristophanes, had been taking place at Eleusis.⁹¹ The theatre at Isthmia dates to the fourth century, though we have no information on what was performed there.⁹² The city theatre at Epidaurus may date to roughly the same period.⁹³ Delphi, like Delos, was holding dramatic contests as part of its Soteria festival to Zeus and Apollo from at least the first quarter of the third century.⁹⁴ The tragic actor Theodorus made a gift towards the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo at Delphi in 363. This may suggest that dramatic performers, like earlier wandering performers and sages, were identifying themselves with Apollo and Delphi by the fourth century.⁹⁵ By at least the second century, the Naia at Dodona also included tragic contests.⁹⁶

⁸⁷ *TrGF* I 50; Diog. Laert. 8.57.

⁸⁸ Athen. 14.621f; *Suda* ρ 171, cf. φ 547; Steph. Byz. τ 1 (p. 260 Billerbeck); *PV*² pp. 9–10; Webster (1948) 17–19; Taplin (1993) 49–50.

⁸⁹ *θέατρον μὲν κατεσκεύασε μετὰ τὸ τῶν Συρακοσίων κάλλιστον τῶν κατὰ Σικελίαν*, 16.83.3.

⁹⁰ See Vassallo (2012); Csapo and Wilson (2015) 336.

⁹¹ *IG* I³ 970; see *DFA*² 47–8; C–S 129; Csapo (2010a) 90–1; Finglass (2015) 212.

⁹² Gebhard (1973) 24–6; Scaparro et al. (1994) II 224–6.

⁹³ Csapo and Wilson (2015) 345.

⁹⁴ Two copies of a decree listing the privileges of the Athenian guild at the Soteria are dated to 279/8 or 278/7: *IG* II–III² 1132 = *FD* III 2.68; Le Guen (2001) I 57–61 no. 2; Aneziri (2003) 347–50 no. A5A; *DFA*² 308.

⁹⁵ *FD* III 5.3.67; on Delphi and travelling sages see Tell (2007) 265–7.

⁹⁶ *IG* V.118.

Though Olympia never possessed a tragic contest, its status as a major Panhellenic gathering may have attracted tragic performers. Diodorus (15.7.2) claims that Dionysius hired actors to perform his works at Olympia. According to Plutarch, Callipides thrust himself on Agesilaus of Sparta at the Isthmia. Whatever the truth behind this anecdote, it suggests the ways in which such gatherings could be used by artists to advertise their talents before great men (and indeed the general mass of foreigners). Callipides, we are told, had become universally famous among all Greeks (*ὄνομα καὶ δόξαν ἔχων ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησι καὶ σπουδαζόμενος ὑπὸ πάντων*, 21.4.3).

In general, dramatic contests appear to have been established in areas where there were strong traditions of musical performance and pre-existing festivals. Corinth may be a case in point. Pindar links the invention of the dithyramb to Corinth, while Herodotus names Arion, who visited the city in the time of Periander, as its inventor.⁹⁷ This tradition, which echoes the claim made by the Sicyonians concerning tragedy, may have served as a founding myth for fifth-century choral performances in Corinth. Xenophon notes that in 393 or 392 the democratic party at Corinth staged a coup on the last day of the festival for Artemis Eucleia, when a large number of the citizens were gathered together to watch the contests.⁹⁸ We are further told that the massacre of their opponents took place in a theatre, where neither audience members nor even the judges of the competitions were spared.⁹⁹

We cannot be certain that these contests included dramatic performances, but there are a number of factors that point to such a possibility. The actor Hipparchus and the poet Xenocleides stayed in Corinth for a lengthy period during the early fourth century, where they availed themselves of the courtesan Neaera's services.¹⁰⁰ A similar anecdote is told by the third-century compiler Machon, but on this occasion the courtesan Gnathaena or her daughter Gnathaenium sleeps with another man while her lover, the actor

⁹⁷ Pind. *Ol.* 13.17–19.

⁹⁸ *Εὐκλείων τὴν τελευταίαν*, *Hell.* 4.4.3; cf. Diod. Sic. 14.86.1.

⁹⁹ *σπασάμενοι τὰ ξίφη ἔπαιον τὸν μὲν τινα συνεστηκότα ἐν κύκλῳ, τὸν δὲ καθήμενον, τὸν δὲ τινα ἐν θεάτρῳ, ἔστι δ' ὃν καὶ κριτὴν καθήμενον*. On the theatre remains see Scaparro et al. (1994) II 152–5.

¹⁰⁰ [Dem.] 59.26; Hipparchus was victorious six times at the Athenian Lenaea from c. 370 (*IRDF* 2325H.27 and *SEG* XXVI.203 col. 2.15; cf. O'Connor 256; Stephanis 1278; *IRDF* p. 121).

Andronicus, is away in Corinth.¹⁰¹ The tragic actor Thessalus, according to Plutarch, was brought in chains from Corinth to Macedonia after helping the young Alexander foil an attempt to marry off his brother to the daughter of a Carian satrap.¹⁰² And the Theban aulete Ismenias was said by Lucian (*adversus indoctum* 5) to have bought his instruments in Corinth. It is possible that these individuals travelled to the Isthmus in order to perform. Productions of comedy are suggested by the iconographic evidence from Corinth.¹⁰³ A comic figurine of a woman holding a large bowl possibly recalls the image of a woman on an early fourth-century Apulian crater in Würzburg, which has been plausibly linked to Aristophanes' *Women of the Thesmophoria*.¹⁰⁴ Green suggests that the play may have become famous in Corinth before passing on to the Greek West. Three Corinthian bell craters display scenes similar to those found on the Italian 'phlyax' vases.¹⁰⁵ They all date from the second quarter of the fourth century, not much later than the Würzburg vase.

The Peloponnese furnishes a number of other examples of cities with comparable festival cultures. The theatre at Argos has been dated to the fifth century and may have been used for the Heraea.¹⁰⁶ The *parodos* of Euripides' *Electra* (171–4) indicates that maiden choruses were at least one element of that festival. Another gathering, the Endymatia, is said by a later source to date to the archaic period and is associated with the poet Sacadas of Argos.¹⁰⁷ Our earliest report of tragic contests is the second-century Tegean actor's inscription (IG V 118) but the date at which these contests were established is unknown. Neighbouring Epidauros is perhaps a similar case: a contest of rhapsodes and 'other music' is said by Plato (*Ion* 530a) to have taken place in the fifth century at the Asclepieia, but none of the

¹⁰¹ Fr. 17 Gow = Athen. 581e; on the confusion of mother and daughter and the resulting chronological difficulties see Gow pp. 9 and 121–2; Andronicus: Stephanis no. 179; O'Connor no. 29.

¹⁰² Plut. *Alex.* 10.

¹⁰³ Green (2014) 344–62.

¹⁰⁴ Athens NM 12556; cf. Corinth 7398 = *MOMC*³ no. AT15e p. 52: a comic figurine of a seated slave from Corinth. Depiction of Ar. *Thesm.*: Würzburg H5697 = *RVAp.* 65, 4 = *LIMC* VII 868 'Telephus' no. 81; see Csapo (1986), (2001) 29, (2010a) 52–67; Taplin (1993) 44, 89–90 and Green (1994) 64–7; Small (2005) 110–12.

¹⁰⁵ Corinth CP 2577 = *PV*² no. 16 p. 25 = *MOMC*³ no. CV4 p. 98; Corinth CP 534 = *PV*² no. 15 p. 25 = *MOMC*³ no. CV3 p. 98; Athens NM 5815 = *PV*² no. 14 p. 25–6 = *MOMC*³ no. CV2 p. 98.

¹⁰⁶ Dilke (1950) 41; Scaparro et al. (1994) II 123.

¹⁰⁷ [Plut.] *De Mus.* 1134b–c.

other events are detailed. The point at which Epidaurus' two theatres began to be used for productions of drama remains unknown.

Beyond the Greek mainland, Samos, like Argos, held a festival for Hera from before the end of the fifth century. According to Plutarch (*Lys.* 18.4), in 404 it was renamed the Lysandreia to celebrate the island's liberation from the Athenians. An early second-century inscription has preserved a fragmentary record of victors at the Heraea in contests for both old and new tragedy.¹⁰⁸ Tragic contests had certainly been adopted by 306, in a festival that celebrated the victory of a another foreign potentate: on this occasion Antigonus and his son Demetrius.¹⁰⁹ Euboea was another island that possessed a vibrant musical culture from an early period. Regulations for the Artemisia at Chalcis mention contests for rhapsodes, aulodes, citharodes, citharists, and competitors in parody.¹¹⁰ By the early third century, Chalcis was a base for a large group of *technitai*. These included dramatic performers, who were to be hired for the contests of the Dionysia and Demetrieia in four Euboean cities.¹¹¹ Across the Mediterranean, Cyrene also seems to have incorporated tragedy into its existing festival programme. The Carneia, a rival to the equivalent festival at Sparta, may have been the site of the first performance of Pindar's fifth *Pythian* (77–80). Records of expenses dating from the second half of the fourth century record the existence of tragic choruses, who may have performed at either the Carneia or a festival for Demeter.¹¹² As Ceccarelli and Milanezi have argued, this North African colony was in no way cut off from the Greek world, but rather interconnected with a Panhellenic festival network from as early as the fifth century.¹¹³

The late fourth century saw an expansion of the theatre world in one major area: the territories previously belonging to the Persian empire. In the course of the campaigns of Alexander, eight musical contests, of which at least four probably involved performances of drama, are recorded in various sources.¹¹⁴ These took place at Tyre in 331, at Salmous after the crossing of the Gedrosian desert in 325,

¹⁰⁸ IG XII/6.1.173.3, 8–9; cf. IG XII/6.1.176–8 for records of the tragic contests at the Samian Dionysia from the mid-third century.

¹⁰⁹ IG XII/6.1.56 = SEG I.362.

¹¹⁰ IG XII/9.189.10–11.

¹¹¹ IG XII/9.207 = Le Guen (2001) I 41–56 no. 1.

¹¹² SEG IX.13 + XLVIII.2052; see Ceccarelli and Milanezi (2007).

¹¹³ Ceccarelli and Milanezi (2007) 214.

¹¹⁴ See the recent detailed study by Le Guen (2014).

Ecbatana in 324 and later Babylon in 323.¹¹⁵ Athenaeus (595d–f) also reports that an otherwise unknown Python of Catana or Byzantium produced a satyr play, the *Agen*, for Alexander at the Hydaspes River, probably in 326. These appear to have been ad hoc celebrations, staged in the brief periods of rest allowed the army on its near relentless advance across Asia. The successors, however, would establish more permanent contests, particularly at Alexandria where a guild of *technitai* was in place by the early third century.¹¹⁶

However, as Csapo and Wilson have argued, the importance of Alexander should not be overstated.¹¹⁷ Already in around 356–353 BC we hear of the performance of the tragedy *Mausolus* by Theodectas at the funeral games for Mausolus in Caria.¹¹⁸ Theodectas may not have been the only Greek from Asia Minor to view or even compose tragedies. At around the same time an interest in tragedy was also growing at Heraclea on the Black Sea coast. We have already noted that the tragic poet Spintharus came from this region. An imperial period history of Heraclea by Memnon, preserved in fragments by Photius (*Bibl.* 224) provides some information on the activities of the fourth-century tyrants of Heraclea. Like Mausolus, Timotheus, the third tyrant of the city, was honoured in death by his brother Dionysus with dramatic contests.

ἐπιτελεῖ δὲ καὶ ἀγῶνας ἵππικους, οὐχ ἵππικους δὲ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ σκηνικούς
καὶ θυμελικούς καὶ γυμνικούς· τοὺς μὲν αὐτίκα, τοὺς δὲ λαμπροτέρους καὶ
ῥσπερον.

He held equestrian contests, and not just equestrian contests, but dramatic and theatrical and athletic ones also, some immediately and some more splendidly later.

(Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F 3)

Diodorus (16.88.5) dates Timotheus' death to 338/7. The fact that the later celebrations were more brilliant than those directly after Timotheus' death suggests that Dionysus may have brought in foreign artists and athletes to perform. The Greeks of Heraclea were probably aware of tragedy in the previous generation. The tyrant Clearchus, who

¹¹⁵ Tyre: χορῶν [ἐγ]κυκλίων καὶ τραγικῶν ἀγῶνας, Plut. *Alex.* 29.1; Salmous: σκηνικούς ἀγῶνας ἐν τῷ θεάτρῳ, Diod. Sic. 17.106.4; Ecbatana and Babylon: ἐν θεάτροις καὶ πανηγύρεσιν, Plut. *Alex.* 72.1; ἀγῶνα ἐπετέλει γυμνικόν τε καὶ μουσικόν, Ar. *Anab.* 7.14.10; ἀγῶνες θυμελικοί, Diod. Sic. 17.110.7; see Le Guen (2014) 257–9.

¹¹⁶ OGIS 50 = Le Guen (2001) I 293–6 no. 60.

¹¹⁷ Csapo and Wilson (2015) 364–78.

¹¹⁸ See Ch. 3.2.a.

took power in 364, was murdered while on his way to join the procession at the local Dionysia.¹¹⁹ According to Memnon, he was a student of Plato and Isocrates and the first tyrant to establish a library.¹²⁰ We may wonder whether he enlisted the help of another associate of Plato from Heraclea, Heraclides Ponticus. Diogenes Laertius lists tragedies among his works and also claims that he was fooled into accepting a *Parthenopaeus* as a work of Sophocles.¹²¹ It is conceivable that he may have been collecting texts for Clearchus.

When we consider the evidence for tragic contests, we must first concede that the record is far from complete. We cannot be certain that all known theatres hosted dramatic contests or that they did so throughout the entire period of their use. Sparta possessed a theatre from the fifth century, yet there is no evidence that productions of drama were ever staged there in the classical period. On the other hand, many of our tragic contests are likely to pre-date the earliest evidence for their existence by some time. If we set these caveats aside, what tentative conclusions can we draw regarding dramatic contests in the fourth century? Our evidence will not allow us to pinpoint one single moment in time that was key for the dissemination of tragedy or any one major influence. Although in principle tragic contests were available as an option for cities and rulers from the fifth century, they decide to invest in theatres, and specifically tragic contests, only gradually and over a considerable period of time. Their reasons for holding (or not holding) dramatic competitions are obscure, but they are likely to have varied from location to location depending on the funds available, the logistics involved, and the interests and ambition of those charged with managing local festivals.

What we see in the classical period is the gradual incorporation of tragedy into an existing festival network. Tragic contests in the fourth century appear to have been held across a wide geographical area, including the Greek West, the Peloponnese, Macedonia, the Aegean, and Asia Minor. If we set aside the conquests of Alexander in Egypt and Asia at the end of our period, this conforms broadly to the limits of the poetic festival network of the fifth and sixth centuries. Many of the cities that hosted dramatic competitions in the Hellenistic

¹¹⁹ Diod. Sic. 16.36.3; for the date cf. Diod. Sic. 15.81.4.

¹²⁰ Plato and Isocrates: Memnon *FGrHist* 434 F 1.1; βιβλιοθήκην μέντοι κατασκευάσαι πρὸ πάντων ἄλλων, οὗς ἡ τυραννὶς ἀπέδειξεν ὀνομάζεσθαι, F 1.2.

¹²¹ 5.92–3; see my note on Spintharus in Appendix 2.

period—such as Argos, Samos, or the cities of Euboea—had long cultivated traditions of musical and choral performance and even, by the late fifth or early fourth century, constructed stone theatres. What does increase is the number of known and established tragic contests on that pre-existing festival network.

b. Performers

The decision to hold a tragic contest may have depended to a large extent on the supply of performers. As we have seen, from the archaic period poets travelled between festivals and patrons, either at the direct request of the cities and rulers who wished to stage entertainments, or in the expectation of opportunities for performance and patronage. This appears to have also been the case in the fourth century, though with the difference that, as we have noted, the number of established tragic contests continued to increase.

Performers appear at least as mobile as in previous epochs and potentially travel even more regularly. Athens remains an important centre on this circuit and the immediate destination, as Plato remarked (*Lach.* 183a7–b2), for all those who wished to demonstrate their skills as tragedians. Yet many of the poets and actors who met with success at Athens were also in demand in other cities. Rather than being in any way dependent on Athens, these centres formed, with Athens, a continually expanding and increasingly established network of tragic contests. The actor Cleander, for example, in addition to winning victories in Athens and Rhodes in the fourth century, was said to have appeared sometime after 413 at Leucas, an island off the Acarnanian coast.¹²² As O'Connor observed, he is likely to have been 'engaged at the time in the practice of his profession ἐπὶ ξένης'.¹²³ By the Hellenistic period the guilds of *technitai* can boast in inscriptions of receiving honour from all the Greeks and it is conceivable that this ambition for Panhellenic recognition was shared by individuals from previous generations.¹²⁴

Because of their mobility, tragic actors were frequently selected as diplomatic envoys. Aristodemus had been contracted to appear at

¹²² Dem. 57.18; cf. section 6.2.a.

¹²³ O'Connor p. 111.

¹²⁴ e.g. in a second-century BC inscription issued by the Ionian Guild: οὗς καὶ θεοὶ καὶ βασιλεῖς καὶ πάντες Ἑλλήνες τιμῶσιν, IG XI/4 1061.12–13; DFA² 314–15; Le Guen (2001) I 231–3 no. 45; Aneziri (2003) 383–5 no. D10.

several cities in 346 (ἐπὶ τὰς πόλεις Aeschin. 2.19.4) when he was selected by the Athenians for the embassy of Philocrates to Macedonia. Ischander, perhaps the son of the tragic actor Neoptolemus, travelled to Athens in 348 as the messenger of the pro-Athenian party in Arcadia (Dem. 19.303). According to Demosthenes, he was introduced to the Athenian assembly by Aeschines as his ‘second actor’ (δευτεραγωνιστής, 19.10), a term which would seem to allude to either his profession or that of his father. These accounts are echoed by the anecdote told by Plutarch (*Alex.* 10), that Alexander chose the tragic actor Thessalus to be his agent in Caria.

Tragic performers moved upon a familiar circuit. The younger Carcinus, who won eleven victories at Athens from the 370s, is one example of a successful Athenian poet who, like Aeschylus, seems to have travelled extensively in Sicily.¹²⁵ His presence in Syracuse was noted by Dionysius II’s fourth-century biographer, Polycritus of Mende.¹²⁶ A tradition even developed that he was a citizen of Acragas, despite the fact that he came from a longstanding Athenian poetic family.¹²⁷ Syracuse under Dionysius and his father seems to have been a hub for foreign thinkers and performers, just as it had been in the time of Hieron. Much of what we are told of Dionysius I’s activities as a patron is invariably coloured by a tradition of hostile invective, which, though dating from the tyrant’s lifetime, became the source of a host of later anecdotes and probable fictions. Thus, according to Diodorus (15.6.1), the poets entertained at Syracuse not only produced their own poems but also helped improve those of their employer. In these stories, Dionysius is not only an egregious performer, but also a jealous and vindictive competitor. The tragic poet Antiphon was supposedly executed for passing comment on his tragedies, while the lyric poet Philoxenus was thrown into the infamous stone quarries of Syracuse.¹²⁸ The story of how Plato was sold as a slave on Aegina for offending Dionysius probably belongs to this same class of tale.¹²⁹ And yet the presence of foreign performers in Syracuse, and even Antiphon’s death at the hand of Dionysius,

¹²⁵ πλεονάκις ἐν ταῖς Συρακούσαις παρεπιδεδημηκώς, Diod. Sic. 5.5.1 = Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 164; victories: see *IRDF* 2325A.43, *SEG* XXVI.203 Col. 1.12.

¹²⁶ *FGrHist* 559 F1 = Diog. Laert. 2.63.

¹²⁷ *Suda* κ 394; *APF* 8254.

¹²⁸ Antiphon: see *TrGF* I 55; Philoxenus: Diod. Sic. 15.6.2, Plut. *de Alex. fort.* 334c, Lucian *adv. indoct.* 15, *Suda* φ 397.

¹²⁹ Plut. *Dion* 5; Diod. Sic. 15.7.1; Tzetzes *Chil.* 23.

is confirmed by fourth-century sources, including Aristotle.¹³⁰ It is probable that despite the legend of the paranoid and cruel tyrant, Syracuse, and Sicily in general, remained an attractive destination for foreign performers.

In the second half of the fourth century, poets and actors were regularly moving between Athens and Macedonia, much as Euripides and Agathon had done in a previous era. After the capture of Olynthus in 348, we are told by Demosthenes that Philip sought out artists to perform at the Olympia at Dion, a festival established by Archelaus in the late fifth century (Diod. Sic. 17.16).

εἰς δὲ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὴν πανήγυριν πάντας τοὺς τεχνίτας
συνήγαγεν.

He brought to this sacrifice and festival all the *technitai*.

(Dem. 19.192.5–6)

Diodorus similarly stresses that the artists who appeared at the festival were foreigners.

πανήγυριν δὲ μεγάλην συστησάμενος καὶ λαμπροὺς ἀγῶνας ποιήσας
πολλοὺς τῶν ἐπιδημούντων ξένων ἐπὶ τὰς ἐστιάσεις παρελάμβανε.

Once he had set up a great festival and instigated splendid contests he brought many of the visiting strangers to the feast.

(16.55.1–2)

Among these performers was the comic actor Satyrus, another artist who achieved success in Athens. His name has been restored to the victors' list for the Athenian Lenaea; if correct, he won six victories there from around 375.¹³¹ Demosthenes records how Satyrus pleaded for the release of his friend's daughters, who had been captured in the sacking of the city. A parallel example of a tragic actor who formed far too close a bond with Philip was Neoptolemus of Scyros, a victor in the tragic contest at the Lenaea in around 370 and at the Dionysia in 341.¹³² Demosthenes (5.6–8) accused him first of acting as a Macedonian apologist to the Athenians and then of absconding to

¹³⁰ Antiphon: Arist. *Rhet.* 1385a. Antiphon's comment on the poor quality of Dionysius' tragedies and his ill-advised praise for Harmodius and Aristogeiton ([Plut.] *X Orat.* 1. 833b and Phil. VS 1.15.3) is, by contrast, not supported by any contemporary source and may be a later invention. Plato's visit to the court of Dionysius I is recorded in *Epist.* 7.326b–327b, which may be genuine.

¹³¹ Dem. 19.193; Aeschin.2.156; *IRDF* 2325F.35.

¹³² *IRDF* 2320 Col. 2.17; 2325H.30; Stephanis 1797.

Pella. According to later sources, he recited passages from tragedy at the wedding of Philip's daughter and Alexander of Epirus, the day before Philip was himself murdered in the theatre at Aegae.¹³³

Alexander would prove no less a patron of the dramatic arts. He summoned performers in advance from Greece in order to celebrate key moments during the course of his campaigns. Plutarch and Arrian claim that as many as 3000 *technitai* were awaiting the arrival of Alexander at Ecbatana.¹³⁴ As Le Guen has argued, it is unlikely that he retained their services on a permanent basis.¹³⁵ According to Plutarch (*Alex.* 29), the tragic actor Athenodorus was fined by the Athenians for failing to appear at the Dionysia, when he competed with Thessalus at a contest held by Alexander in Phoenicia in 331. If this is correct, Athenodorus did not remain with the army, since he is recorded as the victor at the Athenian Dionysia in 329.¹³⁶ According to Athenaeus (539a), however, he was back in Asia, at Susa, by 324. Like the better established city festivals, Alexander's peripatetic court offered enticing opportunities, but only for a limited period. On campaign dramatic contests were neither convenient nor practical, and during these times Alexander's tragedians may have sought employment elsewhere.

In order to facilitate these journeys, tragic performers in the fourth century had already started to assert the rights of security and freedom of movement (*ἀσυλία καὶ ἀτέλεια*) that would be the main demands of the later Hellenistic guilds for their members.¹³⁷ The reverence for a tragedian's *τέχνη* allowed him to travel through and perform in enemy territory. Aristodemus was sent as an ambassador to Philip because of his easy access to the king, partly on account of his profession as an actor (*διὰ τὴν γνῶσιν καὶ φιλανθρωπίαν τῆς τέχνης*, Aeschin. 2.15.8–9). This tendency for actors to be selected as ambassadors is due not only to their professional habit of travelling

¹³³ Diod. Sic. 16.92.3; cf. Stob. 4.34.70.

¹³⁴ *πάλιν ἦν ἐν θεάτροις καὶ πανηγύρεσιν, ἅτε δὴ τρισχιλίων αὐτῷ τεχνιτῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀφιγμένων*, Plut. *Alex.* 72.1; Ar. *Anab.* 7.14.

¹³⁵ Le Guen (2014) 264–6. ¹³⁶ IRDF 2318 col. 13.1705.

¹³⁷ In the early third century, for example, the Delphic Amphictyons granted the Athenian artists freedom from harassment and taxation (*ἀσυλία καὶ ἀτέλεια*). See IG II–III² 1132.1–39 = FD III 2.68.65–94; Le Guen (2001) I 57–61 no. 2; Aneziri (2003) 347–50 no. A5A; DFA² 308. Sifakis (1967) 100–2 lists the relevant inscriptions relating to Delos and Delphi. See also DFA² 288–91, C–S 243–4.

but also the unique protection that they had secured to enable them to do so.

As in previous centuries, artists travelled abroad to take advantage of the opportunity to perform for prizes, fees, and patronage. Philip granted all the competitors at the Olympia a feast, as well as crowns for the victors of the competitions.¹³⁸ In addition he offered them the chance to ask him for a personal reward. It is a relationship that closely parallels that of the archaic or fifth-century poet with his patron, where the poet could expect both presents of coin and a place at his patron's table. We also know from inscriptional evidence that prizes for victorious actors were generous.¹³⁹ The early third-century Chalcis inscription shows that, in addition to prizes and payment in coin, *technitai*, including tragic actors, received food as an allowance for expenses throughout the course of each festival.¹⁴⁰ A star tragic actor, such as Polus, could command high fees. He was honoured by Samos in 306 for performing at a lower rate than usual. Even so, Polus still took the takings raised from the theatre (τὰ ἐκ τοῦ θεάτρου γενόμενα) and expected the Samians to pay the outstanding fees in time.¹⁴¹ Such evidence for high fees may also help explain the evident wealth of an earlier generation of actors. Theodorus gave seventy drachmas towards the temple of Apollo at Delphi in 363, the largest donation recorded on that inscription.¹⁴² Neoptolemus made a contribution towards the renovation of Athens' defences and offered golden cups as dedications on the Acropolis.¹⁴³

Even on the basis of the little information available, the fourth century seems to have been a period of frenetic activity. Tragic actors and poets covered long distances on a circuit that extended, in the wake of Alexander's conquests, from Sicily to Mesopotamia. For these artists, Athens remained a crucial destination: many of those who performed outside Attica are also known to have won victories at the theatre of Dionysus. But Athens never had and never would provide an actor or a poet with employment for more than a few months in a year. For those desirous of more prizes, more recognition, and a greater following, there were ample and growing opportunities

¹³⁸ ἐστιῶν δ' αὐτοῦς καὶ στεφανῶν τοὺς νενικηκότας, Dem. 19.193.1.

¹³⁹ See Lightfoot (2002) 214–15.

¹⁴⁰ IG XII/9 207.21–5. Cf. Le Guen (2001) II 72–3.

¹⁴¹ IG XII/6 56.9–14 = SEG I.362; cf. C-S 242–3 for a translation.

¹⁴² FD III 5.3.67. ¹⁴³ Dem. 18.114; Athen. 472c.

available. To realize these possibilities tragedians had to travel, yet as a profession this was something of which they had long experience.

CONCLUSION

The evidence for the fourth century presents a picture both of change and of continuity. Opportunities for performance increased, while the area traversed by tragedians expanded. From the second half of the century, we have better documented festivals and indications of a greater level of organization in the Panhellenic festival culture. Cities, and even the demes of Attica, were also committing themselves to making a long-term investment in drama by building stone theatres. Alexander's conquests brought tragedians to Mesopotamia and beyond, while at the same time unlocking vast resources with which to fund festivals and competitions. And actors would increasingly come to be recognized as a separate class of performer from the poet, and one of equal value and importance. It is here that we have the origins of the vibrant, varied, and highly organized musical culture of the Hellenistic period: one so well documented in inscriptions, yet from which not a single work of tragedy has survived intact.

Yet in another sense the fourth century presents us with the final stage in the long evolution of the Greek festival circuit. Tragic contests gradually appear at well-established Panhellenic shrines or often in regions with long traditions of musical, and specifically choral, performance. While some cities established entirely new events, dramatic contests were also added to existing festivals. These gatherings of performers are, once again, funded by the wealthy and powerful. Philip and Alexander were continuing a tradition of Macedonian royal patronage for tragedians that extended back at least to Archelaus. Similarly Dionysius' passion for tragedy and his decision to host tragic poets is hardly surprising given the century-old tradition of dramatic performance in the region. Cities and rulers continued to compete in the splendour of their entertainments, the calibre of performers, and the size of their audiences. As a result, tragic poets and actors seem to have had even greater opportunities to enrich themselves and spread their fame.

The fourth century, therefore, represents not the beginning of tragedy's dissemination, or even its critical moment. Rather it marks

the culmination of a continuous process, by which tragedy was established as part of an evolving, yet longstanding, festival culture. These festivals were both disparate and varied, yet they were also interconnected by the travels of both performers and to some extent also audience members. Tragedy, when produced at these events, both celebrated the histories of individual cities and also stood witness to their shared origins and common Panhellenic culture. By the fourth century, tragedy had itself become an integral and canonical part of that culture.

Conclusion

What can we say in conclusion, now that we have come to the end of our inquiry? In considering the performance of tragedy outside Athens in the archaic and classical periods, the first thing the reader will have noticed is probably the regrettable dearth of hard evidence. We have few details or dates of productions and those we have are often based on late sources of questionable reliability. The type of evidence available sets limits on our conclusions: we cannot know exactly which plays were performed or read outside Athens or when or where this took place. Consequently, it is impossible to establish a date, or even a range of years, when the dissemination of tragedy was fully achieved. Even if we could agree on criteria for determining such a moment (and I think even this is doubtful), we would still not have sufficient data to assess whether the criteria had been met.

It was not any abundance of new material, therefore, that initially prompted this search, but rather anomalies in the existing evidence. Although Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides were Athenian citizens, we can be certain that tragedy as a genre was one of the defining elements of Greek culture as a whole. We also know that the works of the three great Athenian tragedians entered the overall Hellenic literary canon and came to define the genre of tragedy. The questions we have asked have thus concerned not so much the time and place, but rather the nature of tragedy's dissemination in the archaic and classical periods. Instead of asking when, we have sought to understand how tragedy was disseminated.

What can we say, then, regarding its nature? First, in its content, tragedy as a genre never *became* Greek; it *was* Greek. We cannot pinpoint one moment when tragedy ceased to be 'Athenian', since it was always Panhellenic in its subject matter and audience. The term 'Greek' or 'Panhellenic' has referred to the tendency of tragedy to

focus not on the mythical traditions of one city, but on the broader narrative of the history and origins of the Greek peoples. These were in many cases reworkings of well-established myths, widely known both from previous and contemporary treatments in epic and lyric. Poets could easily connect local foundation myths with the broader Panhellenic framework by recounting tales of travel and exile. The context of ancient drama expanded over time with additional performances and reperformance in increasingly diverse locations; yet from the beginning the function of tragedy appears always less concerned with the politics of one city and more with relationships between cities.

In a few cases, we have been able to suggest ways in which certain plays may have functioned as Panhellenic art-forms, both outside and within Attica. With a few exceptions, we have focused largely on those tragedies composed specifically for non-Athenian audiences (though to judge from the iconographic evidence this may represent only a tiny fraction of the plays actually performed outside Attica in the classical period). Common themes are present in all of these plays: movement and travel, the genealogy of heroes and origin of local cults, and finally the explicit links drawn between different Greek peoples through a shared ancestry and religious practices. Though these dramas may be unusual, in that they seem to have been produced for a particular audience outside Athens, they are also representative of the genre as a whole in their subject matter.

Second, the dissemination of tragedy took place alongside its development and canonization. Tragedy did not arise in splendid isolation as an Athenian invention, and one which could be exported after a decent period of development. Such a view underestimates both the importance of Athens as a Panhellenic centre and the consequent mix of influences from other parts of the Hellenic world. By the time something that could be termed tragedy appeared at the end of the sixth century, the Greeks were already connected by a complex system of overlapping networks. Despite the prominence of particular cities, such as Athens and Sparta, they possessed no one political or cultural centre. Festivals, at Athens and elsewhere, were important places for Greeks to gather and compete. It is this competitive spirit that encouraged the display and, in the process, exchange in people, goods, ideas, and culture. Tragedy cannot be understood as something broadcast or exported from core to periphery

in a linear direction. Rather, Athens formed an extremely significant part of an overall network of multiple poetic centres.

The dissemination of a tragedy can be said to have begun at the very moment of its first performance, even if that took place in Athens. Athenians believed, with some justification, that their city was the greatest *in all Greece* and that their dramatists and festivals were finer than those of any other city. The Dionysia was inherently panhellenic precisely because Athenian dramatists wished *all Greece* to know that they were the best. Athens was unique only in that it outperformed other cities in areas where all Greeks competed. A truly 'Athenocentric' theatre would not have been in the interest of Athenians, because it would have meant an unacceptable restriction on their claims to supremacy. Yet not all Greeks came to Athens as spectators; many were themselves active competitors in all forms of music, including tragedy, and they came to Athens precisely in order to develop a Panhellenic reputation. These poets had a role in the development of tragedy. One of the earliest tragedians, Pratinas of Phlius, produced works at the Dionysia a quarter of a century before Aeschylus visited Sicily. Doric comedy, together with traditions of choral performance, emerged simultaneously with Athenian forms of drama. None of these poetic traditions was created in isolation.

Third, beyond the play's first performance is a continuous process by which text, poet, and performers move in search of new audiences in other centres. This can be said to have begun within the lifetimes of the three main tragedians and, in the case of Aeschylus and Euripides, was initiated by the poets themselves. They were in good company: poets had taken advantage of the circuit of festivals from an early period, in order both to demonstrate their abilities and to receive rewards. These performers can be described as professionals in the restricted sense that they regularly practised a specialist skill and, in the process, receive payment in either coin or kind. Travel enabled poets to fulfil these two aims of obtaining fame and material gain, since they could take advantage of wider opportunities for display and employment abroad.

We can chart the gradual expansion of the poetic network, as opportunities to perform tragedy became more frequent and festivals better established. We can also legitimately view the fourth century as the time when the works of the three great masters entered the Greek literary canon as definitive classics. Yet both of these processes began

in the poets' own lifetimes and with their active participation. The fourth century and the end of the classical period represent a period of change, yet the theatrical culture of this period is quantitatively rather than qualitatively different from that of previous generations. Furthermore, there is relatively little evidence to suggest that the increasing recognition of actors as a professional body caused or substantially affected the dissemination of tragedy in this period. Leading actors achieved greater recognition than they had in previous generations, but in their aspirations for fame and prizes they differed little from contemporary or earlier poets.

Tragedy's dissemination may thus be said to be, in its nature, a complex and continuous process brought about through performance and reperformance at Panhellenic gatherings. Tragedy as a genre emerged from, and was part of, a Panhellenic song culture shaped by frequent travel, competition, and exchange. From the beginning, individual tragic poets and actors worked hard to make their plays and performances known everywhere and known forever. Most were not successful, but for those few who were a process had begun by which their poems would continue to circulate, long after their deaths and even to the present day. To paraphrase Theognis, they have fitted their heroes with wings, on which they will continue to soar, across land and sea, until the end of time.

Appendices

APPENDIX 1

The Settings of Plays of Greek Tragedy and Satyr Play

Aegean and the Greek Cities of Asia Minor

Crete

Aeschylus *Cretan Women* (fr. 116); **Euripides** *Theseus* (the plot concerned the killing of the Minotaur: Tiiia TrGF); *Cretans* (fr. 472); *Polyidus* (the play concerned the story of Polyidus and Glaucus the son of Minos: cf. Apollod. 3.3.1–2; Hyginus *Fab.* 136); **Sophocles** *Prophets* or *Polyidus*.

Lemnos

Aeschylus *Cabeiri* (?) (see Sommerstein (2008) 108–9); *Lemnians* or *Lemnian Women* (?); *Hypsipyle* (?) (the union of the Lemnian women and the Argonauts was mentioned in the play: Σ' Ap. Rhod. 1.769–73 Wendel p. 68); *Philoctetes* (Dio Chrys. 52.7–8); **Euripides** *Philoctetes* (Dio Chrys. 52.7–8); **Sophocles** *Lemnian Women* A and B (fr. 384, Σ' Ap. Rhod. 1.769–73 Wendel p. 68); *Philoctetes*; **Theodectas** *Philoctetes* (fr. 5b TrGF).

Miletus

Phrynichus *Fall of Miletus* (Hdt. 6.21).

Scyros

Euripides *Scyrians* (Tiia TrGF = PSI XII.1286 col. ii 9–27); **Sophocles** *Lovers of Achilles* (?) (the plot may have concerned the youth of Achilles on Scyros; Lobel, following Fraenkel, suggested that the play's title may be mentioned at P.Oxy. 2257.8 as an example of a work with more than one change of scene); *Scyrians* (?).

Seriphos

Aeschylus *Net-Haulers* (the plot concerned the arrival of Danae and Perseus on Seriphos; the island is mentioned at fr. 47b TrGF) and *Polydectes* (?).

Argos and the Argolis

Argos

Aeschylus *Agamemnon*; *Danaids* (third play of the Danaid trilogy); *Suppliants*; *Telephus* (?) (the plot may have been similar to that of Euripides' *Telephus*: Σ Ar. Ach. 332 Holwerda I 1b p. 54); *Libation Bearers*; **Euripides** *Danae* (the plot concerns the conception of Perseus in a golden shower, fr. 324, cf. Tii–iii TrGF); *Electra*; *Orestes*; *Pleisthenes* (?); *Telephus* (fr. 696.1, 713 TrGF); *Temenidae* (see Ch. 5.1); *Temenus* (see Ch. 5.1); **Phrynichus** *Egyptians* (fr. 1 TrGF); **Sophocles** *Acrisius* (Fr. 64.3 TrGF); *Inachus* (?) (characters in the play refer to Argos and the river Inachus: fr. 270, 271, 287 TrGF); **Theodectas** *Lynceus* (the play concerned the death of Danaus and the probable rescue of Lynceus: Arist. *Poet.* 1452a27–9).

Lerna

Aeschylus *Amymone* (Apollod. 2.1.4; Hyg. *Fab.* 169a).

Mycenae

Euripides *Eurystheus* (?) (the plot covers the journey of Heracles to the Underworld; on Eurystheus as king of Mycenae see Apollod. 2.4.5); **Sophocles** *Atreus* or *Women of Mycenae*; *Electra* (El. 9).

Nemea

Aeschylus *Nemea* (like Euripides *Hypsipyle*, the plot probably concerned the story of Achemorus, whose funeral contests were the origin of the Nemean games: fr. 149a TrGF); **Euripides** *Hypsipyle* (references to the sanctuary at Nemea: fr. 752f.29; 752h.10, 21; 757.108 TrGF).

Tiryns

Euripides *Stheneboea* (Tiia.5, fr. 661.6–7 TrGF); **Xenocles** *Licymnius* (?) (the plot concerned the death of Licymnius, which is situated by Pindar in Tiryns: Pind. *Ol.* 7.29; cf. Apollod. 2.8.2).

Troezen

Euripides *Hippolytus*; *Hippolytus Covered* (Tiib fr. C.15; iic.1a TrGF).

Attica

Athens

Aeschylus *Eumenides* (235ff.); **Euripides** *Aegeus* (like Sophocles' play, the plot seems to have concerned the arrival of the young Theseus in Attica from Troezen, see fr. 1–2 TrGF); *Erechtheus* (fr. 370.3–4 TrGF); **Sophocles** *Aegeus*

(fr. 24 *TrGF* provides an account of the division of land in Attica by the sons of Pandion); *Phaedra* (?) (see Sommerstein et al. (2006) 275).

Colonus

Sophocles *Oedipus at Colonus*.

Eleusis

Aeschylus *Women of Argos* (?) (fr. 17 *TrGF* may concern the burial of Capaneus in Eleusis, cf. Plut. *Thes.* 29.4; the play may belong to the same trilogy as *Eleusinians*); *Eleusinians* (the plot concerned the burial of the Seven against Thebes at Eleusis: Plut. *Thes.* 29.4); *Cercyon* (Apollod. *Epit.* 1.3); **Carcinus** *Alope* (included Cercyon as a character: Arist. *Eth. Nic.* 1150b 10); **Choerilus** *Alope* (in the play Cercyon and Triptolemus, both of whom are associated with Eleusis, were brothers: Paus. 1.14.3); **Euripides** *Alope* (Tiia *TrGF*); *Suppliants*; **Sophocles** *Triptolemus* (Triptolemus, in some accounts a son or descendant of Eleusis, is granted the snake-driven chariot of Demeter: fr. 596; cf. Apollod. 1.5.2; Paus. 1.14.2–3).

Eleutherae

Euripides *Antiope* (fr. 179).

Marathon

Euripides *Heraclidae*.

Salamis

Aeschylus *Women of Salamis* (?) (like Sophocles' *Teucer*, the plot may concern the return of Teucer to Salamis); **Sophocles** *Teucer* (Teucer is rebuked by Telamon (?): fr. 577 *TrGF*).

Thoricus

Sophocles *Procris* (the plot concerned the story of the family of Erechtheus: Pherecyd. fr. 34 *EGM*).

Boeotia

Anthedon

Aeschylus *Glaucus of the Sea* (frr. 25e, 31; cf. Paus. 9.22.7).

Aulis

Euripides *Iphigenia in Aulis*.

Orchomenus

Euripides *Phrixus* B (Tiia.270 TrGF).

Potniae

Aeschylus *Glaucus of Potniae* (?) (Glaucus perhaps departs from Potniae to travel to the funeral games of Pelias: fr. 36 TrGF).

Thebes

Aeschylus *Seven Against Thebes*; *Laïus* (?) (the first play of the Theban tetralogy); *Niobe* (Tantalus travels to Thebes from Asia to console Niobe at the house of Amphion: fr. 154a.10–11; cf. fr. 158, 160 TrGF); *Oedipus* (?) (the second play in the Theban tetralogy); *Pentheus* (a similar plot to Euripides' *Bacchae*: arg. Eur. *Bacch.* 21); *Semele* or *Water Carriers* (the plot concerned the pregnancy of Semele: Σ Ap. Rhod. 1.636a Wendel p. 55); *Sphinx* (satyr play in the Theban tetralogy); *Carcinus Oedipus* (Iocasta promises to produce her son: Arist. *Rhet.* 1417b18); *Semele* (?); **Chaeremon** *Dionysus* (the plot probably concerned the fate of Pentheus: fr. 4 TrGF); **Euripides** *Alcmene* (the plot concerned the seduction of Alcmene by Zeus at Thebes: fr. 87b TrGF, cf. Hes. fr. 195 M–W); *Antigone* (Tiia TrGF); *Bacchae*; *Heracles*; *Oedipus* (fr. 541 TrGF describes the blinding of Oedipus); *Phoenician Women*; **Sophocles** *Antigone*; *Oedipus the Tyrant*; **Spintharus** *Semele Struck By Lightning*.

Central Greece (Excluding Boeotia): Phocis and Aetolia

Calydon

Antiphon *Meleager* (the play presumably featured a dispute between Plexippus, the brother of Althaea, and Meleager over the pelt of the Calydonian boar: Arist. *Rhet.* 1379b20–1); **Euripides** *Meleager* (fr. 515 TrGF); *Oeneus* (fr. 558 TrGF); **Sophocles** *Meleager* (the chorus consisted of priests of Calydon who appeal to Meleager on behalf of their city: Σ Il. 9.575 Erbse II p. 523).

Delphi

Aeschylus *Eumenides* (1–234); **Euripides** *Ion*.

Pleuron

Phrynichus *Pleuronian Women* (the plot concerned the myth of Meleager and Althaea: fr. 5–6 TrGF).

Corinthia and Megaris

Aeschylus *Theōroi* or *Isthmīastai* (a chorus of satyrs describe the temple of Poseidon at Isthmia: fr. 78a.18–22); *Sisyphus Runaway* (?) (the plot probably concerned the return of Sisyphus to Corinth from the Underworld); **Carcinus** II *Medea* (the plot concerned the death of Medea's children in Corinth: *Rhet.* 1400b9–15); **Euripides** *Alcmeon in Corinth* (fr. 74 TrGF, cf. Apollod. 3.7.7); *Medea*; *Sciron* (a satyr play concerning Sciron's defeat by Theseus in the Megaris: Tiia; cf. Apollod. *Epit.* 1.2); **Neophron** *Medea* (see Appendix 2).

Greek West

Aeschylus *Aetnaeae* (see Ch. 4.2.a); **Euripides** *Aeolus* (see Ch. 5.3); *Cyclops*; *Captive Melanippe* (see Ch. 5.3); **Sophocles** *Men of Camicus* (the plot concerns Minos' discovery of Daedalus in Camicus, Sicily, through the trick of the shell: fr. 324 TrGF; cf. Apollod. *Epit.* 1.14).

Ionian Sea: Ithaca

Aeschylus *Bone-Gatherers* (the plot concerned Odysseus' return to Ithaca and mistreatment by the suitors: fr. 179–80 TrGF); *Penelope* (Odysseus appears on Ithaca in disguise as a Cretan: fr. 187 TrGF) **Sophocles** *The Madness of Odysseus* (?) (the plot presumably concerned Odysseus' pretence at madness in a bid to avoid leaving for Troy, as narrated in the *Cypria*: see West (2013a) 102–3).

Non-Greek Locations

Babylon

Python *Agen* (a satyr play mocking Harpalus, Alexander the Great's treasurer; the only fragment refers to a tomb for his concubine Pythonice, which is probably the one he constructed in Babylon: Athen. 595a–596b).

Caria

Aeschylus *Carians* or *Europa* (fr. 101).

Egypt

Aeschylus *Proteus* (?) (satyr play of the *Oresteia* tetralogy; probably concerned the travels of Menelaus in Egypt: cf. *Od.* 4.351–580); **Euripides** *Busiris* (?) (the plot concerned an opponent of Heracles who was killed on the Nile at Memphis: Pherecydes fr. 17 EGM); *Helen*.

Ethiopia

Euripides *Andromeda* (Tiia; fr.145); *Phaethon* (fr. 771, 772 TrGF); **Sophocles** *Andromeda* (?).

Iberia or Adria

Aeschylus *Daughters of the Sun* (the plot covered the death of Phaethon in the region of the river Eridanus, either on the Adriatic coast or in Iberia: fr. 71; cf. Eur. *Hipp.* 737–41; Pliny NH 37.32).

Libya

Aeschylus *Phorcidae* (the plot covered Perseus' theft of the eye of the Graeae at Lake Tritonis: Eratosth. *Cataster.* 22); **Aristias** *Antaeus* (?); **Phrynichus** *Antaeus* or *Libyans* (the plot concerned the wrestling match between Heracles and the Libyan Antaeus: Σ Ar. *Ran.* 689 Holwerda p. III 1a p. 96 and Tzetz. 688a IV 3 p.880; cf. Pherecydes fr. 17 EGM).

Lycia

Euripides *Bellerophon* (Tiia.20 TrGF).

Lydia

Achaeus *Omphale* (?); **Ion** *Omphale* (a satyr play concerning Heracles' period of enslavement to the Lydian queen Omphale: fr. 22, 23, 24, 27 TrGF).

Mysia

Aeschylus *Mysians* (the plot concerned the arrival of Telephus in Mysia: fr. 143 and 144 TrGF; cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1460a27); **Sophocles** *Mysians* (Telephus is informed of his arrival in Mysia: fr. 411 TrGF).

Persia and Susa

Aeschylus *Persians*; **Phrynichus** *Phoenician Women* (a eunuch announces Xerxes' defeat to the Persians: fr. 8 TrGF).

Phaeacia

Sophocles *Nausicaa* or *Women Washing Clothes* (the plot covered the dance of Nausicaa and her maidens, as related in *Od.* 6.99–109: Athen. 20f, Eust. *Od.* 1553, 64f).

Scythia and the Black Sea

[**Aeschylus**] *Prometheus Bound*; *Prometheus Unbound*; **Euripides** *Iphigenia in Tauris*; **Sophocles** *Colchides* (the plot concerned the seduction of Medea and the tasks of Jason: fr. 339, 341, 343, Σ Ap. Rhod. 3.1040c Wendel p. 274);

Scythians (the Argonauts return from Colchis by the same route they had taken on the outward journey: Σ Ap. Rhod. 4.284 Wendel p. 281).

Peloponnese (Excluding Argolis and Corinthia)

Elis and Pisa

Euripides *Oenomaus* (the plot of Euripides' and Sophocles' plays probably both concerned the chariot race for Hippodameia, usually situated at Elis; see Sommerstein and Talboy (2012) 80 n. 24); *Chrysippus* (?) (the plot concerned Laius' seduction of the son of Pelops and elopement in a chariot: cf. Athen. 602f; Taplin 82); **Sophocles** *Oenomaus*; *Tyro* A and B (the plot concerned the rape of Tyro near the river Enipeus: Apollod. 1.90).

Messenia

Euripides *Cresphontes* (Fr. 448a col. II.19 TrGF).

Sicyon

Sophocles *Thyestes of Sicyon*.

Sparta

Pratinas *Dymainai* or *Karyatides* (fr. 1 TrGF, cf. Hesych. δ 2600).

Taenarum

Sophocles *The Men at Taenarum* (frr. 198a–e TrGF).

Tegea

Sophocles *Aleadae* (?) (the plot probably concerned the youth of Telephus and his banishment from Tegea, cf. Hygin. *Fab.* 244).

Thessaly

Euripides *Ino* (the plot concerns the later adventures of Ino after the flight of Phrixus; according to Hyginus *Fab.* 4, these took place in Thessaly; see Finglass (2014b) 70–2); *Wise Melanippe* (see Ch. 5.3a); *Phrixus* A (Tiia.4–5).

Iolcus

Euripides *Peliades* (Medea is before the house of Pelias: fr. 601 TrGF).

Larissa

Sophocles *Men of Larissa* (the plot concerned the death of Acrisius in an athletic contest at Larissa: fr. 378–9 TrGF; Pherecyd fr. 12 EGM; Apollod. 2.4.4).

Pherae

Euripides *Alcestis*; **Phrynichus** *Alcestis* (?) (the plot concerned the death of Alcestis and, like Euripides' play, included the character of Death: Serv. in Verg. *Aen.* 4. 694).

Phthia

Euripides *Andromache*; **Sophocles** *Peleus* (?) (fr. 487 *TrGF* indicates that the plot concerned the old age of Peleus; fr. 492 *TrGF* refers to the king of the Thessalian city of Dotium).

Phylace

Euripides *Protesilaus* (the plot concerns Laodameia's mourning for Protesilaus, king of Phylace: fr. 655 *TrGF*, cf. *Il.* 2.695–702).

Trachis

Sophocles *Women of Trachis*.

Thrace and Macedonia

Aeschylus *Bassarai* or *Bassarids* (second play of the Lycurgus tetralogy; the plot concerned the death of Orpheus at the hands of the Thracian maenads termed Bassarids at Mt. Pangaeum: Eratosth. *Cataster.* 24); *Edonians* (first play of the Lycurgus tetralogy; Lycurgus, king in the Strymon valley, opposes Dionysus: Apollod. 3.5.1); *Lycurgus* (satyr play of the Lycurgus tetralogy); *Youths* (?) (third play of the *Lycurgus* tetralogy); *Nurses* (?) (the plot concerned the rejuvenation of the nurses of Dionysus, perhaps at their home on Mt. Nysa: see Krumeich et al. (1999) 201); *Phineus* (?) (the plot concerned the depredations of the Harpies: fr. 258 and 258a *TrGF*; in the fifth century Phineus is situated either on the Thracian coast of the Black Sea or across the Bosphorus in Asia Minor: Soph. *Ant.* 966–76; Pherecyd. fr. 27 *EGM*); **Euripides** *Archelaus* (see Ch. 5.1); *Sylaeus* (?) (Tiiic *TrGF*; Wilamowitz (1895) I 73–4 n. 134); **Polyphrasmon** *Lycourgeia* tetralogy (?); **Philocles** *Pandionis* tetralogy (?) (the plot concerned the story of Tereus: T6c *TrGF*); **Sophocles** *Thamyras* (?) (the play contains a reference to Mt. Athos: fr. 237 *TrGF*); *Tereus* (fr. 582; cf. *P.Oxy.* 3013.5–6); *Drummers* (fr. 637; cf. fr. 46 *TrGF*); *Phineus* A and B (?).

Troad

Achaeus *Philoctetes* (Agamemnon urges the Achaeans to fight, presumably at Troy: fr. 37 *TrGF*); **Aeschylus** *Thracian Women* (the plot concerned the suicide of Ajax: Σ Soph. *Aj.* 134, 815, 833); *Judgement of Arms* (the plot

concerned the contest for the arms of Achilles, at which Thetis was present: fr. 174 *TrGF*); *Memnon* (Memnon may have arrived at Troy during the course of the play: fr. 300 *TrGF*); *Myrmidons* (first play of the ‘Achilles trilogy’: see West (2000) 340–1); *Nereids* (second or third play in the ‘Achilles trilogy’: see West (2000) 341–3); *Palamedes* (the plot concerned the death of Palamedes at Troy: see Sommerstein and Talboy (2012) 112–27); *Phrygians* or *Ransom of Hector* (second or third play in the ‘Achilles trilogy’: see West (2000) 341–3); *Astydamas Ajax Maddened* (the plot is unknown, but it was presumably similar to that of Sophocles’ *Ajax*); *Hector* (the plot concerned the narrative of the *Iliad*: fr. 1h–i, 2–2a *TrGF*); *Carcinus II Ajax* (the play contained a conversation between Ajax and Odysseus: fr. 1a *TrGF*); *Achilles* (the play contained a reference to a trench, presumably the one surrounding the Achaean camp: fr. 1d *TrGF*, cf. *Il.* 7.341); *Chæremon Achilles Killer of Thersites* (the plot is likely to have concerned at death of Thersites, as narrated in the *Aethiopis*: see West (2013a) 140–2); *Dionysius Ransom of Hector* (the plot is unknown but it is likely to concern the narrative of *Iliad* 24); *Euripides Alexander* (the plot concerned the return of Paris from Mt. Ida to Troy: Tiii–iv *TrGF*); *Hecuba*; *Epeus* (?) (the plot is unknown but is likely to concern the building of the wooden horse: cf. *Od.* 8.493, 11.523); *Palamedes* (the plot concerned the same myth as Aeschylus and Sophocles’ plays); [Euripides] *Rhesus*; *Trojan Women*; *Euripides II Polyxena* (?) (the plot is unknown, but it is likely that it concerned the sacrifice of Polyxena after the fall of Troy); *Ion Guards* (the plot is likely to have concerned the theft of the Palladium from Troy; the play included a conversation between Helen and Odysseus: fr. 44 *TrGF*); *Iophon Sack of Troy*; *Sophocles Ajax*; *Ajax the Locrian* (?) (the plot may have concerned either Ajax’s outrages during the fall of Troy or his return from Troy; Athena appears to reprimand the Argives for the sacrileges following the fall of Troy: fr. 10c *TrGF*); *Alexander* (?) (the play seems to have covered the same myth as Euripides’ *Alexander*: fr. 93 *TrGF*); *Demand for Helen* (?) (the plot may have concerned the embassy to Troy, as related in the *Cypria*: see West (2013a) 116–17); *Eurypylus* (?) (the play featured a quarrel between Eurypylus and Neoptolemus: Plut. *de cohib. ira* 458d; cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1459b6); *Judgement* (the plot concerned the Judgement of Paris: fr. 361 *TrGF*); *Laconian Women* (the plot concerned the theft of the Palladium from Troy by Odysseus: fr. 367–8 *TrGF*, cf. *Σ Ar. Vesp.* 351 Hollwerda II.1 p. 60); *Laocoon* (the plot covered the fall of Troy: fr. 373 *TrGF*); *Nauplius Sails In* (the plot probably concerned the arrival of Nauplius at Troy: Sommerstein and Talboy (2012) 127–30); *Palamedes*; *Shepherds* (the play covered the myth of Protesilaus and Cycnus: see Sommerstein and Talboy (2012) 174–83); *Polyxena* (the play covered the aftermath of the fall of Troy: fr. 522–3 *TrGF*); *Sophocles Priam* (?) (the plot is unknown); *Those who dine together* (Odysseus and Achilles are within sight of Troy: fr. 566 *TrGF*); *Troilus* (the plot concerned the ambush of

Troilus by Achilles: Σ *Il.* 257 Erbse p. 567); *Philoctetes in Troy*; *Phrygians* (?) (the plot may have been similar to that of Aeschylus' *Phrygians* if the reading of a scholion on the *Prometheus Bound* is correct: see Σ [Aesch.] *PV* 436 Herington); **Theodectas** *Ajax* (in the play Odysseus and Ajax dispute the reasons why Diomedes selected Odysseus as his companion, as narrated at *Il.* 10.242–7: Arist. *Rhet.* 1399b28–30, 1400a27–9).

APPENDIX 2

Non-Citizen Performers in Attica

Aegean

Tragic Poets

Achaeus I of Eretria (*TrGF* 20): born c.484–480 (*Suda* α 4683); quoted by Aristophanes in the *Wasps* (1081 = fr. 29 *TrGF*) of 422; *Peace* (356) of 421; and *Frogs* (184 = fr. 11) of 405. **Ion of Chios** (*TrGF* 19): competed unsuccessfully against Euripides and Iophon in 428 coming third (*arg.* Eur. *Hipp.* 25–7); the *Suda* (ι 487) gives the date of his productions in Athens as 452–448; according to Athenaeus (3f) he won at least one victory and, in celebration, allegedly gave a present of Chian wine to the people of Athens; his death in or before 421 is noted by Aristophanes (*Pax* 835–7), who also alludes to one of Ion's dithrambs (*PMG* 745 = Leurini 84).

Tragic Actors

Mynniscus of Chalcis (O'Connor 351; Stephanis 1757): second actor employed by Aeschylus (*Vit. Aesch.* 15); victor at the Athenian Dionysia c.440 (*IRDF* 2325B.4); he is also possibly to be identified with the Mynniscus who was an acquaintance of Callipides (Arist. *Poet.* 1461b34–5) and victor at the Dionysia in 423/3, though this may also be a son or grandson (*IRDF* 2318.586, cf. prosopographical note p. 154; Csapo (2002) 128–31 = (2010a) 119–20).

Comic Poets

Hegemon of Thasos (Stephanis 1053): said to have performed a parody *Gigantomachy* in Athens in around 413 (Athen. 407a–c). **Lynceus of Samos**: defeated Menander in a comic contest (*Suda* λ 776).

Dithyrambic Poets

Bacchylides of Ceos (Sutton 15): *Ode* 19 Maehler appears to have been written for performance in Athens, possibly at the Dionysia (see Maehler II p. 241). **Hypodicus of Chalcis** (Sutton 3): directed the first winning chorus at the Dionysia in 509/8 (*Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 46). **Melanippides I of Melos** (Sutton 6): directed a winning chorus at the Dionysia in 494/3 (*Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 47). **Melanippides II of Melos** (Sutton 18): grandson of Melanippides I; satirized by Pherecrates (fr. 155.3 K–A); admired in Athens for his dithyrambs (Xen. *Mem.* 1.4.3). **Simonides I of**

Ceos (Sutton 7): relative of Simonides II of Ceos, victor at Athens in 489/8 (*Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 49). **Simonides II of Ceos** (Sutton 11): victor at Athens in 477/6 (*Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 54); guest of Hipparchus before 514 ([Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228 b–c).

Aulos Players

Euius of Chalcis (Stephanis 952): performed for a successful chorus at the Dionysia in 320/19 (*IG* II–III² 3056).

Others

Anacreon of Teos: the tyrant Hipparchus is said to have been his patron in Athens before 514 ([Pl.] *Hipparch.* 228 b–c); he is also known to have praised the Athenian family of Critias son of Dropides in his poetry, perhaps around the end of the sixth century (Pl. *Charm.* 157e; Σ [Aesch.] *PV* 128 (Dindorf p. 15) = fr. 412 *PMG*). **Archedamus of Thera** (Stephanis 430): described as a choral dancer (χορῶν ὀρχηστής) on an Attic cave inscription c.450–400 BC (*IG* I² 785 = *SEG* XXIX.48). **Euenus of Paros**: the tutor of the sons of Callias, son of Hipponicus, in Athens around 399 (Pl. *Ap.* 20a–b); he is remembered as a poet (Pl. *Phaed.* 60d, 267a). **Phrynus of Mytilene** (Stephanis 2583): victor at the contest for citharodes at the Panathenaea in 456/5 or 446/5 (Σ *Ar. Nub.* 971 Holwerda I 3.1 p. 187); his poems were apparently popular in Athens c.420 (*Ar. Nub.* 971; cf. Pherecrates fr. 155.14 K–A). **Sogenes of Siphnus** (Stephanis 2326): aulete in the Athenian navy in the early fourth century (*IG* II–III² 1951.101).

Asia Minor and the Black Sea

Tragic Poets

Phanostratus of Halicarnassus (*TrGF* 94): won a victory at the Dionysia in 306 (*IG* II–III² 3073); a statue of Phanostratus was set up by his countrymen in Athens (*IG* II–III² 2794). **Spintharus of Heraclea Pontica** (*TrGF* 40): described by the *Suda* (σ 945) as a tragic poet, and author of a *Heracles* and a *Semele*, from Heraclea. He may be the same Spintharus who is called a barbarian and a Phrygian in Aristophanes' *Birds* (762; cf. Σ *Ar. Av.* 762b Holwerda II 3 p.119). This identification has been disputed, however.¹ It is argued that Spintharus is a nickname for the late fourth-century philosopher and pupil of Zeno, Dionysius of Heraclea. According to Diogenes Laertius, this man passed off his play the *Parthenopaeus* as a work of Sophocles, convincing Heraclides Ponticus: (ἐτι καὶ Διονύσιος ὁ Μεταθέμενος—ἦ

¹ See Sommerstein (1987a) 346; Dunbar (1995) 471; Kaimio (1999) 55 n. 32.

Σπίνθαρος, ὡς ἔνοι—γράψας τὸν Παρθενοπαῖον ἐπέγραψε Σοφοκλέους 5.92). The meaning of the text is ambiguous: Diogenes could be giving an alternative name for Dionysius or attributing authorship to another poet from Heraclea, named Spintharus. The latter is more likely since Spintharus (or its variant forms) is attested as a proper name for both Athenians and non-citizens in the fifth century.² Diogenes does not endorse the alternative suggestion that Spintharus is the author, but merely mentions it as a possibility. Furthermore, the *Parthenopaeus* is not mentioned in the list of Spintharus' plays in the *Suda* and the compilers may have been aware of Aristophanes' Spintharus from a different source. Spintharus, therefore, could quite possibly have been a Greek whose home-city was in the vicinity of barbarian Phrygia. If so, this probably led Aristophanes to characterize him as Phrygian in the *Birds*. See Kotlińska-Toma (2015) 143–4. **Theodectas of Phaselis** (*TrGF* 72): his name has been restored to the list of victors at the Dionysia after Astydamos: if correct, he gained his first victory, out of a future total of seven, around 370 (*IRDF* 2325.11, pp. 148–9). An epigram, said to have been placed on his tomb in Attica, recorded eight successes out of thirteen competitions (Steph. Byz. p. 660 Meineke = *FGE* 1572–5).

Comic Poets

Dionysius of Sinope: victor once at the Lenaea in the second half of the fourth century (*IRDF* 2325E.53); origins (Athen. 467d, 497c, 615e). **Diphilus of Sinope** (O–B 6811): a poet of New Comedy and contemporary of Menander (Anon. *De Com* III.62 Holwerda I 1a p. 10), who was victorious on three occasions at the Lenaea towards the end of the fourth century (*IRDF* 2325E.63); origins (Strab. 12.3.11; *IG* II–III² 10321); a family memorial to himself, his father, and brother (the comic poet Diodorus) was found in the Piraeus (*IG* II–III² 10321).

Dithyrambic Poets

Timotheus of Miletus (Sutton 33): Plutarch (*de superst.* 170a) refers to a performance of his monodic poem the *Artemis* at Athens. For criticism on the Athenian comic stage see Pherecrates fr. 155.19–28 K–A; Anaxandr. fr. 6 K–A; Antiph. fr. 110 K–A; [Plut.] *de Mus.* 1132e; see Olson (2007) 182, 184–5 and Power (2010) 516–35. He allegedly received encouragement from Euripides: Satyrus F6 (p.111 Schorn) = *P.Oxy.* 1176 fr. 39 col. 22; Plut. *an seni*

² A non-Athenian slave of unknown origin is recorded with the name Σπίνθαρος on an inscription of 405 (*IG* I³ 1032.132 = O–B 8013), while a possible metec named Σπινθήρ is recorded in the late fourth century (*IG* II–III² 1570.87 = O–B 8014). See further Masson (1992) 109–10 = (2000) 128–9.

resp. ger. sit 795d. A reperformance of his dithyramb the *Elpenor* won a victory in the late fourth century (IG II–III² 3055; see Hordern (2002) 82).

Others

Ion of Ephesus: rhapsode who appears at the Panathenaea in the late fifth century in Plato's *Ion* (530a–b).

Central Greece: Boeotia and Locris

Comic Actors

Aristodemus of Scapphae (in Boeotia) or **Scarphea** (in Locris) (Stephanis 333): actor in Menander's *Dyscolus* in 316 (*arg. Dysc.* Sandbach;). **Lyon of Scarphea** (O'Connor 319; Stephanis 1567): twice victorious at the Lenaea c.350 (IRDF 2325F.48).

Dithyrambic Poets

Corinnus of Opus (Sutton 46; Stephanis 1482): directed a chorus of boys at the Thargelia of 352/1 (SEG XXVII.18). **Pheidias of Opus** (Sutton 47; Stephanis 2467): directed a chorus of boys at the Thargelia in 349/8 (SEG XXVII.19). **Pindar of Thebes** (Sutton 16): composed dithyrambs in praise of Athens (Fr. 74a–88 S–M). **Polyzelus of Thebes** (Sutton 43; Stephanis 2097): poet of a winning boy's chorus at the Thargelia in 363/2 (SEG XXVII.12).

Aulos Players

Bacchylides of Opus (Stephanis 514): mocked as a sophist by Plato the comedian in the late fifth century (fr. 149 K–A). **Chairis of Thebes** (Stephanis 2594): satirized by Aristophanes as an inferior aulos player (*Ach.* 15–6, 866, *Pax* 950–5, *Av.* 858) and as a citharode by Pherecrates (fr. 6 K–A); origins (Σ Ar. *Ach.* 866a Holwerda I 1b p. 113). **Chares of Thebes** (Stephanis 2598): performed in a rural Dionysia in the fourth century (IG II–III² 3106). **Commes of Thebes** (Stephanis 1475): performed at the Thargelia of 352/1 (SEG XXVII.18). **Lycus of Thebes** (Stephanis 1564): performed for a chorus in the fourth century (IG II–III² 3046). **Oeniades of Thebes** (Stephanis 1932): son of Pronomus of Thebes, performed at the Thargelia in 384/3, 359/8, and 357/6 (IG II–III² 3064, SEG XXVI.220, XXVII.17;). **Potamon of Thebes** (Stephanis 2131; O–B 2453): son of Olympichus of Thebes, his funeral stele was erected in Attica and may date to the first half of the fourth century (IG II–III² 8883). **Pronomus of Thebes** (Stephanis 2149): an Attic vase c.400 depicts Pronomus in the company of a satyric chorus (Naples 3240 = ARV² 1336.1 = MTS² no. AV25 p. 49).

Greek West: Italy and Sicily

Tragic Poets

Achaeus II of Syracuse (*TrGF* 79): victorious at the Lenaea in c.356 (*IRDF* 2325.242, pp. 206–7; *Suda* α 4682). **Dionysius of Syracuse** (*TrGF* 76): victorious once *in absentia* at the Lenaea in 367 (Diod. Sic. 15.73.5); according to Tzetzes (*Chil.* 5. 23. 178–82), one of the winning plays was entitled the *Ransom of Hector*. **Sosiphanes of Syracuse** (*TrGF* 92): victorious seven times (*Suda* σ 863) in the second half of the fourth century; died in 313/12 (*Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 B 15).

Tragic Actors

Aristodemus of Metapontum (O'Connor 62; Stephanis 332); acted on an Athenian embassy to Philip in 346 and may have been granted Athenian citizenship before then; origins (*Σ* Aeschin. 2.15 p.59 Dilts). **Archias of Thurii** (O'Connor 87; Stephanis 439): victor at the Lenaea in the second half of the fourth century (*IRDF* 2325H.43); origins (*Vit. X Orat.* 849b; Plut. *Dem.* 28).

Comic Poets

Alexis of Thurii: victor at the Dionysia in 347 (*IRDF* 2318.1474) and victorious at least twice in the Lenaea (*IRDF* 2325E.45); origins (*Suda* α 1138). **Apollo-dorus of Gela**: a poet of the New Comedy and contemporary of Menander (*Suda* α 3405); victor at the Lenaea before Diphilus (*IRDF* 2325E.62).

Dithyrambic Poets

Charilaus of Locri (Stephanis 2612; Sutton 56): directed a winning chorus at the Dionysia in 328/7 (*IG* II–III² 3052). **Stesichorus II of Himera** (Sutton 41): won a victory at Athens in 369/8 (*Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 73). **Telestes of Selinus** (Sutton 36): directed a winning chorus at Athens in 402/1 (*Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 65).

Aulos Players

Midas of Acragas (Stephanis 1702): victor at the Pythian games of 494 and 490 and the Panathenaea (Pind. *Pyth.* 12.1–6; *Σ Pyth.* 12 Inscr. Drachmann II p. 263).

Others

Moschus of Acragas (Stephanis 1748): mentioned as a citharode by Aristophanes; according to the scholion he was from Acragas (*Ach.* 13; *Σ ad loc.* Holwerda I 1.b p. 7).

Peloponnese and Megaris

Tragic Poets

Aristarchus of Tegea (*TrGF* 14): a contemporary of Euripides who is said to have produced plays in 454 (*Suda* α 3893; Eusebius *Chronica* Ol.81.3 p. 110 Helm). The *Suda* records two victories. **Aristias of Phlius** (*TrGF* 9): produced his father Pratinas' plays in 467 (*arg.* Aesch. *Sept*); his name has been restored to the list of tragic poets at the Dionysia, two places after Sophocles (*IRDF* 2325A.17; cf. *Vit. Soph.* 19). **Neophron of Sicyon** (*TrGF* 15): Diogenes Laertius (3.134) and the *Suda* (ν 218 Adler) make the claim that Euripides' *Medea* was actually by Neophron. However, according to the *Hypomnemata* attributed to Aristotle and Dicaearchus (*arg.* Eur. *Med.* a 25–7), Euripides plagiarized the text of a completely separate *Medea*, which is quoted by Stobaeus and in scholia on Euripides' text (*Σ Med.* 666, 1387; Stob. 3.20.33; see Mastronarde (2002) 57–60). We know almost nothing else about Neophron, despite the *Suda*'s claim that he composed as many as 120 plays (a suspiciously high number). Modern scholars have suggested that the play ascribed to Neophron may have been a forgery (see Page (1938) xxxvi; Mastronarde (2002) 60–4; Mossman (2011) 23–8; *contra* Michelini (1989) 125–34). It has been argued that Neophron was not a fifth-century tragedian at all, but rather a legendary poet from Sicyon, who was invented as part of the Dorian claim to the invention of tragedy (Mossman (2011) 25; see Ch. 4.1.a). However, Aristophanes is known to have accused Euripides of collaborating with his contemporaries Cephisophon and Meletus and this may have been something of a standard joke.³ A similar claim could have been made by the comic poets for Neophron in the 430s. The note in the *Suda* that Neophron was the first poet to introduce pedagogues and the torture of slaves may also be derived from old comedy.⁴ Neophron may thus have been a fifth-century poet and associate of Euripides, whose name was tagged on to a later version of the *Medea* (Mastronarde (2002) 61). **Pratinas of Phlius** (*TrGF* 4): competed against Aeschylus and Choerilus around 499 and 496 (*Suda* π 349).

³ Ar. *Ran.* 944, 1301, 1408, 1452–3 with scholia. A version of this criticism is found in the biographical tradition (*Vit. Eur.* Ia 3 *TrGF*) where not only Cephisophon but an otherwise unknown Argive Timocrates helped him write his odes. Other collaborators listed in the *Vita* are his kinsman Mnesilichus and Socrates. For other examples in comedy see e.g. Ar. *Nub.* 553–6; Heath (1990) 151–2.

⁴ Beating; e.g. Ar. *Pax* 742–7; *Vesp.* 1292–6; *Ran.* 616–17; lower-class characters: *Ran.* 947–9.

Dithyrambic Poets

Antiphilus of Megara: (Stephanis 223; Sutton 45) poet of a winning boy's chorus at the Thargelia in 354/3 (*SEG* XXVI.220). **Epicurus of Sicyon** (Stephanis 859; Sutton 52): directed a chorus of boys at the Thargelia in 344/3 (*IG* II–III² 3068). **Hegemon of Phlius** (Stephanis 1051; Sutton 44): directed a chorus at the Thargelia in 359/8 (*SEG* XXVII.16). **Hellanicus of Argos** (Stephanis 832; Sutton 64): directed a chorus of boys at Athens on perhaps two occasions; his name has been restored to a choregic monument of 337/6 (*IG* II–III² 3078; Raubitschek (1943) 53–5). **Lasus of Hermione** (Sutton 2): active in Athens before 514 (Hdt. 7.6); Aristophanes (*Vesp.* 1411) presents him as a rival to Simonides in the dithyrambic contest; he is said to have produced dithyrambs at Corinth (*Σ* Pind. *Ol.* 13.26b Drachmann I pp. 361–2) and may have done so at the Athenian Dionysia after the institution of contests in 509/8.

Aulos Players

Alexippus of Argos (Stephanis 123): performed at the Thargelia for a chorus of boys in 363/2 and 361/0 (*SEG* XXVII.12 and 14; *IG* II–III² 3067). **Alcathous of Sicyon** (Stephanis 130): performed at the Thargelia for a chorus of boys in 359/8 (*SEG* XXVII.16). **Aratus of Argos** (Stephanis 291): performed for a winning chorus at the Dionysia in the fourth century (*IG* II–III² 3038). **Ariston of Argos** (Stephanis 378): performed for a chorus at the Dionysia, perhaps in the fifth century (Antigenes *Anth. Pal.* 13.28 = *FGE* 33–44). **Callistratus of Tegea** (Stephanis 1359): performed at the Thargelia for a chorus of boys in 349/8 (*SEG* XXVII.19). **Cleanthes of Sicyon** (Stephanis 1416): performed at the Thargelia for choruses of boys in 362/1 and 360/59 (*SEG* XXVII.13 and 15). **Pantaleon of Sicyon** (Stephanis 1997): performed for a chorus of boys in 320/19 (*IG* II–III² 3055). **Philip of Sicyon** (Stephanis 2503): performed for a chorus of men at the Dionysia, at the end of the fourth or start of the third century (*IG* II–III² 3078). **Satyrus of Sicyon** (Stephanis 2237): performed at the Thargelia for a chorus of boys in 344/3 (*IG* II–III² 3068). **Telephanes of Megara** (Stephanis 2408): aulete for Demosthenes at the Dionysia of 351/50 (Dem. 21.17) and at a deme festival on Salamis (*IG* II–III² 3093).

Others

Epicles of Hermione (Stephanis 858): a citharist entertained by the young Themistocles in the late sixth or early fifth century (Plut. *Them.* 5.3).

Northern Greece: Epirus, Macedonia, and Thrace*Comic Poets*

Epicrates of Ambracia: poet of middle comedy active c.380–350 from Ambracia (Athen. 422f).

Comic Actors

Satyrus of Olynthus (O'Connor 429; Stephanis 2235): his name has been restored to the Lenaeon victors' list from the second half of the fourth century (IRDF 2325F.35); appeared in Dion in 347 after the fall of Olynthus (Dem. 19.193; Diod. Sic. 16.55); origins in Olynthus (Athen. 591e).

Dithyrambic Poets

Polyidus of Selymbria (Sutton 37): directed a winning chorus in Athens between 399/8 and 380/79 (*Marm. Par.* = FGrHist 239 A 68).

Aulos Players

Lysimachides of Epidamnus (Stephanis 1581): performed for a winning chorus at the Dionysia in 328/7 (IG II-III² 3052;).

Disputed or Uncertain Origins*Tragic Poets*

Acestor (*TrGF* 25): a possible tragic poet satirized as a foreigner and barbarian. Callias (fr. 17 K-A) says he is a poet who is detested by his choruses, while Satyrus (Satyrus F6 p.106 Schorn = *P.Oxy.* 1776 fr. 39, col. 15) lists Acestor among Euripides' less gifted competitors. Aristophanes described a son of Acestor as a foreigner (ξένος τις, *Vesp.* 1221). In a fragment of Eupolis' *Flatterers* (performed a year after the *Wasps* in 421) the father is presented not only as a flatterer but also as a branded run-away slave and therefore a foreign non-citizen (τὸν στιγματίαν, fr. 172.14 K-A). Acestor is also given the name Sacas by Aristophanes (*Av.* 31). The scholion explains this as a term for foreigners from the name of a Thracian tribe, while a different entry on the *Wasps* calls Acestor a Mysian.⁵ The Persian name Datis, allegedly given to a son of the elder Carcinus, may similarly have been a nickname for a 'barbarian' tragic poet.⁶ In comedy Acestor seems to be trying to get himself accepted as an Athenian citizen. Pisetaerus complains in the *Birds* that Sacas, as a non-citizen, is trying to force his way into Athenian society (ὁ μὲν γὰρ ὧν οὐκ ἄστος εἰσβιάζεται, 32). MacDowell (1993) 366-7 has suggested that he might have been the son of an Athenian man and a foreign woman who had been denied citizenship on the basis of Pericles' citizenship

⁵ Σ Ar. *Av.* 31 (Holwerda II.3 p.12); Σ Ar. *Vesp.* 1221 (Holwerda II 1 p. 192); Herodotus (7.64) and Choerilus of Samos (fr. 319 SH) equate the Sacae with Scythians.

⁶ Ar. *Pax* 291; Σ *Ran.* 86 (Holwerda III 1a p. 17).

law of 450 BC. A fragment of Metagenes, also quoted by the scholiast, might suggest that Acestor at some point achieved citizenship:

ὦ πολῖται, δεινὰ πάσχω. {B.} τίς πολίτης δ' ἔστ' ἔτι
πλὴν ἄρ' εἰ Σάκας ὁ Μυσὸς καὶ τὸ Καλλίου νόθον;

Oh citizens, I suffer terrible things. <Second Speaker> What citizen is there, besides Sacas the Mysian and the illegitimate offspring of Callias?

(fr. 14 K–A)

The phrase ‘illegitimate offspring’ (τὸ Καλλίου νόθον) suggests a disenfranchised son of Callias by a foreign woman: could Acestor have been in the same position? Once again, however, the meaning of the text is ambiguous: the joke is that ‘Sacas’ is not a *bona fide* citizen and that there is no other citizen except (πλὴν) Acestor.

Apollodorus of Tarsus? (TrGF 64): his name has been restored to the list of victorious tragic poets at the Lenaea from around 380 (IRDF 2325G.21). His origins in Tarsus are recorded in the *Suda* (α 3406). It is possible that this notice derives from comedy. His case resembles that of the tragic poet Spintharus—a Greek from Heraclea whom Aristophanes may have caricatured as a Phrygian. See also the actor Hippocles, who was mocked by Alexis for being from Cilicia, the region in which Tarsus is situated. Theodectas is one certain example of a tragic poet from Phaselis, a Greek city in neighbouring Lycia. **Meletus** (TrGF 47–8): said by Aristophanes (fr. 156 K–A) to have had Thracian connections. Euripides is accused of taking inspiration from the drinking songs (σκολία) of Meletus in *Frogs* (1302) and a scholion reports that this individual was a tragic poet (Σ Ar. *Ran.* 1302c Holwerda III 1a p. 146). This source, however, also claims that this was the same Meletus as Socrates’ accuser in 399 (cf. Pl. *Ap.* 23e4–5), who must have been an Athenian citizen. Snell posited the existence of two separate men named Meletus. Scurrilous accusations of foreign descent could be made against *bona fide* Athenian citizens in comedy, though, as MacDowell (1993) 370–1 argued, there may be genuine reasons for such assertions in particular cases. It is possible that this Meletus was an Athenian citizen with property or relatives in Thrace.

Patrocles of Thurii or Athens (TrGF 57–8): A tragic poet named Patrocles is said to have come from Thurii in Italy (Clem. Alex. *Protr.* 2.30.4). However, the god Wealth in Aristophanes’ play (84) visits the house of a certain Patrocles in Athens. A scholion on this line (Holwerda III 4a p. 23) adds that he was a rich Athenian and a poet. It is possible that the scholiast has confused two men with the same name. **Theognis of Megara or Athens** (TrGF 28): a tragic poet called Theognis was mocked by Aristophanes in 425 and 411 (*Ach.* 9–12 and *Thesm.* 170); the *Suda* (θ 136) mentions that a Thognis from Megara was the author of an elegy for the survivors of the siege

of Syracuse; this may however be a confusion with the more famous elegiac poet; a scholion on the *Acharnians* identifies the tragic poet as another Theognis, an Athenian who became one of the thirty tyrants in 404/3 (Σ *Ar. Ach.* 11 Holwerda I.1b p. 7; cf. *Xen. Hell.* 2.3.2; *Lys.* 12.6).

Tragic Actors

Ischander of Scyros? (O'Connor 264; Stephanis 1303): possibly the son of Neoptolemus of Scyros, active c.348; according to Demochares he worked in the same acting troupe as Aeschines, though this may be an inference from Demosthenes' description of Ischander as Aeschines' second actor (*δευτεραγωνιστής*) in the assembly (*Dem.* 19.10, 303; Demochares *FGrHist* 75 F 6a = *Vit. Aeschin.* 7). **Neoptolemus of Scyros** (O'Connor 359; Stephanis 1797): performed at the Dionysia in 342/1, 341/0 and was victorious at the actors' contest in 342/1 (*IRDF* 2320 Col. 2); victorious once at the Lenaea c.370 (*IRDF* 2325H.30); origins on Scyros (Σ *Dem.* 5.6, Dils I p. 123); MacDowell (2000) 210–11 suggested that Neoptolemus may have been a member of the Athenian cleruchy on Scyros and thus an Athenian citizen, possibly the same man as the Neoptolemus son of Anticles of the deme of Melite (*APF* 10652). **Polus of Aegina or Athens** (O'Connor 421; Stephanis 2187–8): said to come from Aegina and to have been a pupil of Archias of Thurii (*Plut. Dem.* 28); associated with Demosthenes ([*Plut.*] *Vit. X Orat.* 848b); Lucian, however, indicates that he may have come from Sunium (*Men.* 16).

Tragic or Comic Actors?

Hippocles of Cilicia? (O'Connor 259; Stephanis 1281): mocked by Alexis (fr. 43 K–A). For tragic poets who were said to have had barbarian origins see Acestor, Apollodorus, Meletus, and Spintharus.

Comic Poets

Amphis from Athens or Andros: poet of middle comedy possibly active from c.350; according to the Suda (α 1760) he was an Athenian, but his name is not commonly attested in Attica and an Amphis from Andros is mentioned in a decree of 332/1 (*IG* II–III² 347). **Anaxandrides of Camirus or Colophon:** first victorious at the Dionysia in 377/6 and again in 376/5 (*Marm. Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 A 70; *IRDF* 2318.1150); victorious three times at the Lenaea (*IRDF* 2325E.37); origins (Suda α 1982; *Athen.* 373f). **Diocles of Phlius or Athens:** poet active in the period of transition between old and middle comedy (Suda δ 1155). **Antiphanes:** born 408–404 and victorious eight times at the Lenaea from around 360 (*IRDF* 2325E.41); places of origin include Athens, Ceos, Larissa, Rhodes, or Smyrna (Suda α 2735; *Anon. De Com.* III.45–6 Holwerda I 1a p. 10); he may have been granted citizenship

later in life. **Philemo of Syracuse or Soloi**: a poet of the New Comedy, who was victorious at least once at the Dionysia in 327 (*Marm Par.* = *FGrHist* 239 B 7) and three times at the Lenaea after 316 (*IRDF* 2325E.61); according to the *Suda* (φ 327) he was a little older than Menander and active in the reign of Alexander the Great. According to one tradition, he was originally from Syracuse and later received Athenian citizenship (Anon. *De Com.* III.55–6 Holwerda I 1a p. 10). Strabo (14.5.8), however, believed that he was from Soloi. **Sophilus of Sicyon or Thebes**: comic poet of the fourth century (*Suda* σ 881).

Others

Alcaeus (Stephanis 131): mentioned in old comedy as a citharode from either Sicily or the Peloponnese (Eupolis fr. 303 K–A).

APPENDIX 3

Phrynichus in Sicily?

Aeschylus may not have been the first tragedian to arrive in Sicily. Phrynichus, an older contemporary of Aeschylus, might also have travelled to the island. The evidence is far from strong, but I feel that the possibility is worth mentioning, and so I include it here. A passage in a treatise on comedy referred to another Phrynichus, the late fifth-century comic poet, as the son of Phradmon and claimed that he died in Sicily.¹ However, according to the scholiast of Aristophanes' *Frogs*, the name of the comedian's father was not Phradmon but Eunomides.² Could it in fact be the tragic poet who travelled to Sicily and died there?

There is some confusion as to the name of the tragedian's father. The *Suda*, in its entry on the tragedian, lists three possibilities: Polyphradmon, Minyrus, and Chorocles.³ If Phrynichus the tragic poet's father was called Polyphradmon, then the author of the *De Comoedia* might have confused the two. The first four letters of his name could easily have been lost during the copying of the manuscript or, as Snell suggests, Polyphradmon could have been also known as Phradmon.⁴

Happily a scholion on Aristophanes' *Birds* somewhat clarifies this issue.⁵ There were four men named Phrynichus: (a) the tragic poet and son of Polyphradmon, (b) the comic poet, (c) the Athenian general and later oligarch in 411 BC and, finally, (d) an actor, the son of Chorocles, possibly the same Phrynichus as the retired dancer implicated in the mutilation of the herms in 415.⁶ Chorocles was therefore not the father of the earlier tragedian. The claim that the tragic poet Phrynichus (a) was the son of Polyphradmon

¹ Φρύνιχος Φράδμονος ἔθανεν ἐν Σικελίᾳ. Anon. *De Com.* 3.32 (Koster p. 9). Phrynichus comicus: cf. *testimonia* K–A vol. 7 pp. 393–4. Wilamowitz (1897) 395 assumed a reference to the tragic poet. Harvey (2000) makes the case that this passage refers to the comedian; cf. Nervegna (2013) 19.

² Σ Ar. *Ran.* 13a (Holwerda III 1a p.7).

³ *Suda* φ 762: Φρύνιχος Πολυφράδμονος ἢ Μινύρου, οἱ δὲ Χοροκλέους. A Phrynichus son of Melanthes, probably active in the third century, is attested by the *Suda* φ 765, with whom the Aldine edition of the scholia on Aristophanes confuses the elder tragedian (νῖός Μελανθᾶ, Σ Ar. *Vesp.* 1490b Holwerda II 1 p.231); see Sutton (1987) 12.

⁴ T 6 TrGF.

⁵ Σ Ar. *Av.* 749b (Holwerda II 3 p.117).

⁶ Phrynichus the oligarch: cf. Thuc. 8.25–7, 48–51, 54, 68 and 90. Phrynichus the actor may be the retired dancer listed Andoc. 1.47 (Φρύνιχος ὁ ὀρχησάμενος). Snell TrGF p. 69 suggested that he may have belonged the same family as Phrynichus the

is given weight by the *Suda*, which notes that the tragedian himself had a son, whom he named Polyphrasmon and who also became a tragic poet, losing to Aeschylus in 467.⁷ We know that the sons of poets would usually enter the same profession as their fathers. There was also no cross-over between tragic and comic families: the son of a tragic poet always produces tragedies. Furthermore, Greeks tended to give their sons the name, or style of name, of their fathers.⁸ Therefore, if a certain Phrynichus had a son named Polyphradmon who was a tragedian, then it is likely that he was a tragic poet and that his father's name was Polyphradmon.

Did the author of the comic treatise only get the name of the father wrong? He may have known of a tradition in which Phrynichus the comedian died in Sicily. However, the tradition of a death in Sicily seems more likely to have been associated with Phrynichus the tragedian rather than the comedian. It is conceivable that Hieron might have invited both Phrynichus and Aeschylus to Syracuse at the same time. The *Phoenician Women* of Phrynichus was as suitable as Aeschylus' *Persians* trilogy for Hieron's grand celebration of the wider Greek victory. If Hieron was looking to invite Aeschylus to Sicily at this time, he might have heard of this play and could have persuaded Phrynichus to return to Sicily. And if Aeschylus went to Sicily to produce the *Aetnaeae* in 476, Phrynichus probably went with him. He could then have died in Sicily before 472, prompting Aeschylus to make an implicit tribute to him in the opening words of the *Persians* (*arg. Pers.* 5–7). Phrynichus' works were certainly known in Sicily by the fourth century, and his own travels may have contributed to his fame on the island (see Timaeus *FGrHist* 566 F 32 = Athen. 250b).

He might even have been in Sicily before 480. The most obvious time for Phrynichus to travel to the Greek West was after the disastrous reception of his *Capture of Miletus* in the late 490s, for which he was fined a thousand drachmas.⁹ If he did go to Sicily at that time he may well have visited the tyrant Gelon, who ruled in Gela and later Syracuse from 491, or his brother

tragedian; cf. Sutton (1987) 12. See Sommerstein (1987b) who argues against suggested emendations of the text of Andocides.

⁷ *Suda* φ 762: καὶ παῖδα ἔσχε τραγικὸν Πολυφράσμονα (Πολυφράδμονα AG); *arg. Sept.* 8–9.

⁸ e.g. Aeschylus was the son of Euphorion, whose sons Euphorion and Euaeon were both said to be tragedians, the former producing his father's plays posthumously (*Suda* αἰ 357; ε 3800). Sophocles had two grandsons named Sophocles, one of whom was a tragic poet (*Suda* σ 816; *Vit. Soph.* 13). Carcinus the son of Xenotimus had an uncertain number of sons including the tragic poet Xenocles and another named Xenotimus: see Σ Ar. *Pax* 783 (Holwerda II 2 p.122); Σ Ar. *Vesp* 1502 (Holwerda II 1 p.232). The grandson of Carcinus, also called Carcinus, was a celebrated tragic poet of the fourth century. See Sutton (1987) 12–18.

⁹ Hdt. 6.21; cf. Σ Ar. *Vesp*. 1490a (Holwerda II 1 p. 230); Ael. *VH* 13.17.

Hieron, who acted as regent in Gela from 486. He must have returned to Athens after 479, when he won a victory with Themistocles as his *chorēgos*, probably with the *Phoenician Women*.¹⁰

We have no other evidence for Phrynichus' presence in Sicily, but we know little about Phrynichus' career in any case. He might just be the earliest Athenian tragic poet to have travelled abroad. He is also one of the earliest of the tragedians, a pupil, the *Suda* tells us, of Thespis, who was thought to have performed the first tragedies in Athens around 530.¹¹ Tragic poets appear to have travelled for almost as long as tragedy existed.

¹⁰ Plut. *Them.* 5.5; see Lloyd Jones (1966) 23–4 = (1990) 233–4.

¹¹ See Lloyd-Jones (1966) 19; West (1989); Connor (1990) and Scullion (2002) 81–4 have questioned the traditional dating of the early tragedians. However, even if the dates for Phrynichus are uncertain, he was certainly somewhat older than Aeschylus: see Ar. *Ran.* 910, 1298–1300; Ar. *Vesp.* 219 and 269.

Bibliography

- Agócs, P., Carey C., and Rawles, R. (2012) (eds.) *Reading the Victory Ode* (Cambridge).
- Alexopoulou, M. (2009) *The Theme of Returning Home in Ancient Greek Literature* (Lewiston).
- Allan, W. (2000) *The Andromache and Euripidean Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Allan, W. (2001) 'Euripides in *Megale Hellas*: some aspects of the early reception of tragedy', *G&R* 48: 67–86.
- Allan, W. and Kelly, A. (2013) 'Listening to many voices: Athenian tragedy as popular art', in A. Marmodoro and J. Hill (2013) (eds.) *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity* (Oxford) 77–122.
- Alwine, A.T. (2016) 'Freedom and patronage in the Athenian democracy', *JHS* 136: 1–17.
- Anderson, G. (2005) 'Before *turannoi* were tyrants: rethinking a chapter of early Greek history', *CA* 24: 173–222.
- Aneziri, S. (2003) *Die Vereine der dionysischen Techniten im Kontext der hellenistischen Gesellschaft* (Stuttgart).
- Aneziri, S. (2007) 'The organisation of music contests in the Hellenistic period and artists' participation: an attempt at classification', in Wilson (2007a) (ed.) 67–84.
- Aneziri, S. (2009) 'World travellers: the associations of Artists of Dionysus', in Hunter and Rutherford (2009a) (eds.) 217–36.
- Athanassaki, L. and Bowie, E. (2011) (eds.) *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics and Dissemination* (Berlin).
- Austin, C. (1968) *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in Papyris Repertis* (Berlin).
- Bailey, C., Bowra, C.M., Barber, E.A., Denniston, J.D., and Page, D.L. (1936) (eds.) *Greek Poetry and Life: Essays presented to Gilbert Murray on his seventieth birthday, January 2, 1936* (Oxford).
- Bakogianni, A. (2011) *Electra, Ancient and Modern: Aspects of the Reception of the Tragic Heroine*, *BICS Suppl.* vol. 113 (London).
- Barron, J.P. (1961) 'The son of Hyllis', *CR* 11: 185–7.
- Barron, J.P. (1964) 'The sixth-century tyranny at Samos', *CQ* 14: 210–29.
- Barron, J.P. (1984) 'Ibycus: Gorgias and other poems', *BICS* 31: 13–24.
- Bartol, K. (2000) 'Ion of Chios and the King (Ion, 27, 1–3 W. = 2, 1–3 G.-P.)', *Mnem.* 53: 185–92.
- Battezzato, L. (2013) 'Dithyramb and Greek tragedy', in Kowalzig and Wilson (2013) (eds.) 93–110.
- Beecroft, A.J. (2008) 'Nine fragments in search of an author: poetic lines attributed to Terpanther', *CJ* 103: 225–41.

- Bell, J.M. (1978) 'Κίμβιξ καὶ σοφός: Simonides in the Anecdotal Tradition', *QUCC* 28: 29–86.
- Bergmann, B. and Kondoleon, C. (1999) (eds.) *The Art of Ancient Spectacle* (Washington, DC).
- Bernand, A. (1985) *La Carte du Tragique: La Géographie dans la Tragédie Grecque* (Paris).
- Berve, H. (1967) *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, 2 vols. (Munich).
- Bieber, M. (1941) 'A tragic chorus on a vase of 475 BC', *AJA* 45: 529–36.
- Block, E. (1985) 'Clothing makes the man: a pattern in the *Odyssey*', *TAPA* 115: 1–11.
- Boardman, J. (1991) *Athenian Black Figure Vases*, 2nd edn. (London).
- Boardman, J. and Vaphopoulou-Richardson, C.E. (1986) (eds.) *Chios: A Conference at the Homereion in Chios (1984)* (Oxford).
- Boedeker, D. and Raafaub, K. A. (1998) (eds.) *Democracy, Empire and the Arts in Fifth Century Athens* (Cambridge MA and London).
- Borza, E.N. (1982) 'Athenians, Macedonians and the origins of the Macedonian royal house', in Vanderpool (1982) (ed.) 7–13.
- Bosher, K. (2012a) (ed.) *Theater Outside Athens: Drama in Greek Sicily and South Italy* (Cambridge).
- Bosher, K. (2012b) 'Introduction', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 1–16.
- Bosher, K. (2012c) 'Hieron's Aeschylus', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 97–111.
- Bosher, K. (2014) 'Epicharmus and early Sicilian Comedy', in Revermann (2014) (ed.) 79–94.
- Bosworth, A.B. (1996) 'Alexander, Euripides and Dionysus', in Wallace and Harris (1996) (eds.) 140–66.
- Bowersock, G.W., Burkert W., and Putnam, M.C.J. (1979) (eds.) *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Berlin).
- Bowie, E. (2007) 'Early expatriates: displacement and exile in archaic poetry', in Gaertner (2007) (ed.) 21–49.
- Bowie, E. (2009) 'Wandering Poets, archaic style', in Hunter and Rutherford (2009a) (eds.) 105–36.
- Bowie, E. (2012) 'Epinicians and patrons', in Agócs et al. (2012) (eds.) 83–92.
- Bowie, E. (2015) 'Stesichorus at Athens', in Finglass, P.J. and Kelly, A. (2015) (eds.) *Stesichorus in Context* (Cambridge) 111–24.
- Bowra, M. (1934) 'Stesichorus in the Peloponnese', *CQ* 28: 115–19.
- Bradshaw, D.J. (1991) 'The Ajax myth and the polis: old values and new', in Pozzi and Wickersham (1991) (eds.) 99–125.
- Brandt, J.R. and Iddeng, J.W. (2012) (eds.) *Greek and Roman Festivals* (Oxford).
- Braswell, B.K. (1992) *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean One* (Freiburg).
- Bremer, J.M. (1991) 'Poets and their patrons', in Hofmann and Harder (1991) (eds.) 39–60.
- Broggiato, M. (2014) 'Aristophanes and Aeschylus' *Persians*: Hellenistic discussions on Ar. *Ran.* 1028F', *RhM* 157: 1–16.

- Brown, A.L. (1990) 'Prometheus Pyrphoros', *BICS* 37: 50–6.
- Burian, P. (2011) 'Athenian Tragedy as democratic discourse', in Carter (2011a) (ed.) 95–117.
- Burkert, W. (1979) 'Kynaithos, Polycrates, and the Homeric Hymn to Apollo', in Bowerstock et al. (1979) (eds.) 53–62.
- Burkert, W. (1985) *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA).
- Burnett, A.P. (1988) 'Jocasta in the West: the Lille Stesichorus', *CA* 7: 107–54.
- Burnett, A.P. (1989) 'Performing Pindar's Odes', *CP* 84: 283–93.
- Butrica, J.L. (2001) 'Democrates and Euripides *Andromache* (Σ *andr.* 445 = Callimachus fr. 451 Pfeiffer)', *Hermes* 129: 188–97.
- Cahn, H.A. and Simon, E. (1980) (eds.) *Tainia: Festschrift für Roland Hempe* (Mainz).
- Cairns, D. and Liapis, V. (2006) (eds.) *Dionysalexandros* (Swansea).
- Cairns, F. (1998) (ed.) *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar: Tenth Volume* (Leeds).
- Cairns, F. (2011) 'Money and the poet: the first stasimon of Pindar *Isthmian* 2', *Mnem.* 64: 21–36.
- Cairns, F. (2012) 'Pyrrich dancing and politics in Euripides' *Andromache*', *QUCC* 100: 31–47.
- Calame, C. (1977) *Les Choeurs de Jeunes Filles en Grèce Archaique*, 2 vols. (Rome).
- Cameron, A. (1965) 'Wandering Poets. A literary movement in Byzantine Egypt', *Historia* 14: 470–509.
- Campbell, D.A. (1988) *Greek Lyric II* (Cambridge, MA).
- Campbell, D.A. (1992) *Greek Lyric IV* (Cambridge, MA).
- Carey, C. (1989) 'The performance of the victory ode', *AJP* 110: 545–65.
- Carey, C. (1991) 'The victory ode in performance: the case for the chorus', *CP* 86: 192–200.
- Carey, C. (2007) 'Pindar, place and performance', in Hornblower and Morgan (eds.) (2007) 199–210.
- Carpenter, T.H. and Faraone, C.A. (1993) (eds.) *Masks of Dionysus* (Ithaca).
- Carter, D.M. (2004) 'Was Attic Tragedy democratic?', *Polis* 21:1–25.
- Carter, D.M. (2007) *The Politics of Greek Tragedy* (Bristol).
- Carter, D.M. (2011a) (ed.) *Why Athens? A Reappraisal of Tragic Politics* (Oxford).
- Carter, D.M. (2011b) 'Plato, drama and rhetoric', in Carter (2011a) (ed.) 45–67.
- Carter, J.C. (2004) 'The Greek identity at Metaponto', in Lomas (2004) (ed.) 363–90.
- Cartledge, P. (1997) '"Deep plays": theatre as process in Greek civic life', in Easterling (1997) (ed.) 3–35.
- Cartledge, P., Cohen, E. E., and Foxhall, L. (2002) *Money, Labour and Land: Approaches to the Economies of Ancient Greece* (London and New York).
- Cawkwell, G.L. (1995) 'Early Greek tyranny and the people', *CQ* 45: 73–86.

- Ceadel, E.B. (1941b) 'Resolved feet in the trimeters of Euripides and the chronology of the plays', *CQ* 35: 66–89.
- Ceccarelli, P. (2010) 'Changing contexts: Tragedy in the civic and cultural life of Hellenistic city-states', in Gildenhard and Revermann (2010) (eds.) 99–150.
- Ceccarelli, P. and Milanezi, S. (2007) 'Dithyramb, tragedy and Cyrene', in Wilson (2007a) (ed.) 185–214.
- Chanotis, A. (1990) 'Zur Frage der Spezialisierung im griechischen Theater des Hellenismus und der Kaiserzeit auf der Grundlage der neuen Prosopographie des dionysischen Techniten', *Ktema* 15: 89–108.
- Clauss, J.J. and Johnston, S.I. (1997) (eds.) *Medea: Essays on Medea in Myth, Literature, Philosophy and Art* (Princeton).
- Clay, D. (1991) 'Alcman's Partheneion', *QUCC* 39: 47–67.
- Cogan, M.L. (1953) 'Toward a definition of professionalism', *Harvard Educational Review* 21:33–50.
- Cogan, M.L. (1955) 'The problem of defining a profession', *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 297: 105–11.
- Cohen, E. (2000) *The Athenian Nation* (Princeton).
- Collard, C., Cropp, M.J., and Gibert, J. (2004) *Euripides. Selected Fragmentary Plays Volume II* (Oxford).
- Collard, C., Cropp, M.J., and Lee, K.H. (2009) *Euripides: Selected Fragmentary Plays Volume I*, 2nd edn. (Oxford).
- Compton, T. (2006) *Victim of the Muses: Poet as Scapegoat, Warrior, and Hero in Greco-Roman and Indo-European Myth and History* (Cambridge, MA).
- Connor, W.R. (1990) 'City Dionysia and Athenian democracy', in Connor et al. (1990) (eds.) 7–32.
- Connor, W.R., Hansen, M.H., Raaflaub, K.A., and Strauss, B.S. (1990) (eds.) *Aspects of Athenian Democracy* (Copenhagen).
- Constantinidou, S. (1998) 'Dionysiac Elements in Spartan Cult Dances', *Phoenix* 52: 15–30.
- Coo, L. (2013) 'A Sophoclean slip: mistaken identity and tragic allusion on the Exeter *pelike*', *BICS* 56: 67–88.
- Cousland, J.R.C. and Hume, J.R. (2009) (eds.) *The Play of Texts and Fragments* (Leiden and Boston).
- Croally, N.T. (1994) *Euripidean Polemic: the Trojan Women and the Function of Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- Croon, J.H. (1952) 'The Palici: an autochthonous cult in ancient Sicily', *Mnem.* 5: 116–29.
- Cropp, M. (2003) 'Hypsipyle and Athens', in Csapo and Miller (2003) (eds.) 129–45.
- Cropp, M. and Fick, G. (1985) *Resolutions and chronology in Euripides. The fragmentary tragedies* (BICS Suppl. 43, London).

- Cropp, M., Lee, K., and Sansone, D. (2000) (eds.) *Euripides and Tragic Theatre in the Late Fifth Century* (Champaign).
- Crowther, C. (2007) 'The Dionysia at Iasos: its artists, patrons and audience', in Wilson (2007a) (ed.) 294–332.
- Cruess, S.R., Johnston, S., and Cruess, R.L. (2004) '"Profession": a working definition for medical educators', *Teaching and Learning in Medicine* 16: 74–6.
- Csapo, E. (1986) 'A Note on the Würzburg Bell-Crater H5697 ('Telephus Travestitus')', *Phoenix* 4: 379–92.
- Csapo, E. (2001) 'The first artistic representations of theatre: dramatic illusion and dramatic performance in Attic and South Italian art', in Sanguinetti Katz et al. (2001) (eds.) 17–38.
- Csapo, E. (2002) 'Kallipides and the floor sweepings: the limits of realism in classical acting and performance styles', in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 127–47. [= Csapo (2010a) 117–39].
- Csapo, E. (2004a) 'Some social and economic conditions behind the rise of the acting profession in the fifth and fourth centuries BC', in Hugoniot et al. (2004) (eds.) 53–76.
- Csapo, E. (2004b) 'The politics of the New Music', in Murray and Wilson (2004) (eds.) 207–48.
- Csapo, E. (2007) 'The men who built the theatres: *theatropolai*, *theatrotonai* and *arkhitektones*', in Wilson (2007a) (ed.) 87–121.
- Csapo, E. (2010a) *Actors and Icons of the Ancient Theatre* (Chichester).
- Csapo, E. (2010b) 'The context of choregic dedications', in Taplin and Wyles (2010) (eds.) 79–130.
- Csapo, E. (2014) 'Introduction', in Csapo et al. (2014) (eds.) 1–12.
- Csapo, E., Goette, H.R., Green, J.R., and Wilson, P. (2014) (eds.) *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century BC* (Berlin).
- Csapo, E. and Miller, M.C. (2003) (eds.) *Poetry, Theory, Praxis: The Social Life of Myth, Word, and Image in Ancient Greece* (Oxford).
- Csapo, E. and Miller, M.C. (2007) (eds.) *The Origins of Theatre in Ancient Greece and Beyond: From Ritual to Drama* (Cambridge).
- Csapo, E. and Wilson, P. (2015) 'Drama outside Athens in the fifth and fourth centuries BC', *TC* 7: 316–95.
- Cullen, C.C. (2009) *Pheidias: The Sculptures and Ancient Sources* (London).
- Currie, B. (2004) 'Reperformance scenarios for Pindar's odes', in Mackie (2004) (ed.) 49–69.
- Currie, B. (2005) *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).
- Currie, B. (2011) 'Epinician choregia: funding a Pindaric chorus', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011) (eds.) 269–310.
- D'Angour, A. (2006) 'The new music—so what's new?', in Goldhill and Osborne (2006) (eds.) 264–83.

- D'Angour, A. (2007) 'The sound of *mousiké*: reflections on aural change in ancient Greece', in Osborne (2007) (ed.) 288–300.
- Dąbrowa, E. (1998) (ed.) *Ancient Iran and the Mediterranean world* (Krakow).
- Dale, A.M. (1967) *Euripides Helen* (Oxford).
- Davidson, J. and Rosenbloom, D. (2012) (eds.) *Greek Drama IV: Texts, Contexts and Performance* (Oxford).
- Davies, J.K. (1971) *Athenian Propertied Families* (Oxford).
- Davies, M. (1988) 'Monody, choral lyric and the tyranny of the handbook', *CQ* 38: 52–64.
- Davies, M. (1991) *Sophocles Trachiniae* (Oxford).
- Davies, M. and Finglass, P.J. (2014) *Stesichorus. The Poems* (Cambridge).
- Dawe, R.D., Diggle, J., and Easterling, P.E. (1978) (eds.) *Dionysiaca* (Cambridge).
- Dearden, C.W. (1990) 'Fourth century drama in Sicily: Athenian or Sicilian?', in Descoeudres (1990) (ed.) 231–42.
- Dearden, C.W. (1999) 'Plays for export', *Phoenix* 53: 222–48.
- Deforge, B. (1987) 'Eschyle et la légende des Argonautes', *REG* 100: 30–44.
- Deper, D. (2007) 'From hymn to tragedy: Aristotle's genealogy of poetic kinds', in Csapo and Miller (2007) (eds.) 126–49.
- Descoeudres, J.P. (1990) (ed.) *Greek Colonists and Native Populations* (Oxford and Canberra).
- Detienne, M. (1967) *Les Maîtres de Vérité dans la Grèce Archaïque* (Paris).
- Di Gregorio, L. (1987) 'L'"Archelao" di Euripide nei suoi rapporti con il "Temenos" e i "Temenidi"', *Civiltà Class. e Christ.* 8: 279–318.
- Di Gregorio, L. (1988) 'L'"Archelao" di Euripide: tentativo di ricostruzione', *Aevum* 62: 16–49.
- Diggle, J. (2004) *Theophrastus. Characters* (Cambridge).
- Dilke, O.A.W. (1950) 'Details and chronology of the Greek theatre caveas', *ABA* 45: 20–62.
- Dodds, E.R. (1960) 'Morals and politics in the *Oresteia*', *PCPS* 6: 19–31. [= Lloyd (2007) (ed.) 245–64].
- Dougherty, C. (1991) 'Linguistic Colonialism in Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae*', *GRBS* 32: 119–32.
- Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. (1993) (eds.) *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece* (Cambridge).
- Dougherty, C. and Kurke, L. (2003) (eds.) *The Cultures within Ancient Culture: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration* (Cambridge).
- Dover, K. (1968) *Aristophanes. Clouds* (Oxford).
- Dover, K. (1972) *Aristophanic Comedy* (London).
- Dover, K. (1986) 'Ion of Chios: his place in the history of Greek literature', in Boardman and Vaphopoulou-Richardson (1986) (eds.) 27–37.
- Dover, K. (1993) *Aristophanes. Frogs* (Oxford).
- Dunbar, N. (1995) *Aristophanes. Birds* (Oxford).

- Duncan, A. (2011) 'Nothing to do with Athens: tragedians at the courts of tyrants', in Carter (2011a) (ed.) 69–91.
- Duncan, A. (2012) 'A Theseus outside Athens: Dionysius I of Syracuse and tragic self-presentation', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 137–55.
- Duncan Jones, A. (1980) 'Metic Numbers in Periclean Athens', *Chiron* 10: 101–9.
- Easterling, P.E. (1993) 'The end of an era? Tragedy in the early fourth century', in Sommerstein et al. (1993) (eds.) 559–69.
- Easterling, P.E. (1994) 'Euripides outside Athens: a speculative note', *ICS* 19: 73–80.
- Easterling, P.E. (1997) (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- Easterling, P.E. (1999) 'Actors and voices. Reading between the lines in Aeschines and Demosthenes', in Goldhill and Osborne (1999) (eds.) 154–66.
- Easterling, P.E. (2002) 'Actor as Icon', in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 327–41.
- Easterling, P.E. and Hall, E. (2002) (eds.) *Greek and Roman Actors: Aspects of an Ancient Profession* (Cambridge).
- Else, G. (1945) 'The case of the third actor', *TAPA* 76: 1–10.
- Elsner, J.B. and Rutherford, I. (2005) (eds.) *Pilgrimage in Graeco-Roman and early Christian antiquity: Seeing the gods* (Oxford).
- Epstein, S. (2008) 'Why did Attic building projects employ free labourers rather than slaves?', *ZPE* 166: 108–12.
- Euben, J.P. (1986) (ed.) *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (Berkeley).
- Fairweather, J. (1974) 'Fiction in the biographies of ancient writers', *Ancient Society* 5: 231–76.
- Fearn, D. (2007) *Bacchylides: Politics, Performance, Poetic Tradition* (Oxford).
- Finglass, P.J. (2005) 'Is there a polis in Sophocles *Electra*?', *Phoenix* 59: 199–209.
- Finglass, P.J. (2007a) *Sophocles. Electra* (Cambridge).
- Finglass, P.J. (2007b) *Pindar. Pythian Eleven* (Cambridge).
- Finglass, P.J. (2011) *Sophocles. Ajax* (Cambridge).
- Finglass, P.J. (2012a) 'Sophocles' Theseus', in Markantonatos and Zimmermann (2012) (eds.) 41–53.
- Finglass, P.J. (2012b) 'Ethnic Identity in Stesichorus', *ZPE* 182: 39–44.
- Finglass, P.J. (2014a) 'Introduction', in Davies and Finglass (2014) 1–91.
- Finglass, P.J. (2014b) 'A new fragment of Euripides' *Ino*', *ZPE* 189: 65–82.
- Finglass, P.J. (2015) 'Ancient reperformances of Sophocles', *TC* 7: 207–23.
- Fisher, N.R.E. (1989) 'Drink, hybris and the promotion of harmony in Sparta' in Powell (1989) (ed.) 26–50.
- Forsdyke, S. (2005) *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy: The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece* (Princeton).
- Fraenkel, E. (1954) 'Vermutungen zum Aetna-Festspiel des Aeschylus', *Erano*s 52: 61–75. [= (1964) I 249–62].

- Fraenkel, E. (1964) *Kleine Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, 2 vols. (Rome).
- Frederiksen, R. (2002) 'The Greek theatre: a typical building in the urban centre of the polis', in Nielson (2002) (ed.) 65–124.
- Froning, H. (2002) 'Masken und Kostüme', in Marow and Nölle (2002) (eds.) 70–95.
- Gaertner, J.F. (2007) (ed.) *Writing Exile: The Discourse of Displacement in Greco-Roman Antiquity and Beyond*, Mnem. Suppl. 283 (Leiden).
- Gagné, R. and Govers Hopman, M. (2013) (eds.) *Choral Mediations in Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- Gakopoulou, K. (2012) 'Euripides' *Bacchae*. The end of an era or the beginning of a new one?', in Markantonatos and Zimmermann (2012) (eds.) 163–80.
- Gardiner, N.E. (1930) *Athletics of the Ancient World* (Oxford).
- Garland, R. (2014) *Wandering Greeks: The Ancient Greek Diaspora from the Age of Homer to the Death of Alexander the Great* (Princeton).
- Gavrie, A.F. (2009) *Aeschylus. Persae* (Oxford).
- Gauthier, P. (1976) *Un Commentaire Historique des Poroi de Xénophon* (Paris).
- Gebhard, E. (1973) *The Theatre at Isthmia* (Chicago).
- Gentili, B. (1979) *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World: Hellenistic and Early Roman Theatre* (Amsterdam).
- Gentili, B. (1988) *Poetry and Its Public in Ancient Greece* (Baltimore and London).
- Gerber, D.E. (1982) *Pindar's Olympian One: A Commentary* (Toronto).
- Ghiron-Bistagne, P. (1974) 'Die Krise des Theaters in der griechischen Welt im 4. Jahrhundert v. u. Z.', in Welskopf, E. C. (1974) (ed.) *Hellenische Poleis: Krise, Wandlung, Wirkung* (Berlin) III 1335–71.
- Ghiron-Bistagne, P. (1976) *Recherches sur les acteurs dans la Grèce antique* (Paris).
- Ghiron-Bistagne, P., Moreau, A., and Turpin, J.-C. (1993) (eds.) *Les 'Perses' d'Eschyle* (Montpellier).
- Gildenhard, I. and Revermann, M. (2010) (eds.) *Beyond the Fifth Century: Interactions with Greek Tragedy from the Fourth Century BCE to the Middle Ages* (Berlin).
- Giuliani, L. (1995) *Tragik, Trauer und Trost: Bildervasen für eine Apulisch Totenfeier* (Hannover).
- Giuliani, L. (1996) 'Rhesus between dream and death: on the relation of image to literature in Apulian vase painting', *BICS* 41: 71–86.
- Giuliani, L. (2001) 'Sleeping Furies: allegory, narration and the impact of texts in Apulian vase painting', *SCI* 20: 17–38.
- Goff, B. (1995) (ed.) *History, Tragedy, Theory* (Austin).
- Gold, B.K. (1987) *Literary Patronage in Greece and Rome* (Chapel Hill and London).
- Golden, M. (1998) *Sport and Society in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).
- Golden, M. (2008) *Greek Sport and Social Status* (Austin).

- Golden, M. (2011) 'War and peace in the ancient and modern Olympics', *G&R* 58: 1–13.
- Goldhill, S. (1987) 'The Great Dionysia and civic ideology', *JHS* 107: 39–61. [Revised in Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.) 97–129].
- Goldhill, S. (1997) 'The audience in Athenian tragedy', in Easterling (1997) (ed.) 54–68.
- Goldhill, S. (1999) 'Programme notes', in Goldhill and Osborne (1999) (eds.) 1–29.
- Goldhill, S. (2000) 'Civic ideology and the problem of difference: the politics of Aeschylean tragedy once again', *JHS* 120: 34–56.
- Goldhill, S. and Hall, E. (2009) (eds.) *Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition* (Cambridge).
- Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. (1999) (eds.) *Performance, Culture and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge).
- Goldhill, S. and Osborne, R. (2006) (eds.) *Rethinking Revolutions through Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).
- Goodlett, V.C. (1991) 'Rhodian sculpture workshops', *AJA* 95: 669–81.
- Goossens, R. (1962) *Euripide et Athènes* (Brussels).
- Gösswein, H.-U. (1975) *Die Briefe des Euripides* (Meisenheim am Glan).
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of the Epic* (Cambridge).
- Greco, E. (1998) (ed.) *Siritide e Metapontino: storie di due territori coloniali* (Naples).
- Green, J.R. (1991b) 'On seeing and depicting the theatre in classical Athens', *GRBS* 32: 15–50.
- Green, J.R. (1994) *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society* (London).
- Green, J.R. (2002) 'Towards a reconstruction of performance style', in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 93–126.
- Green, J.R. (2014) 'Regional theatre in the fourth century: the evidence of comic figurines of Boeotia, Corinth, and Cyprus', in Csapo et al. (2014) (eds.) 333–70.
- Greenwalt, W. (1985) 'The introduction of Caranus into the Argead king list', *GRBS* 26: 43–9.
- Gregory, J. (2005a) (ed.) *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* (Malden, MA).
- Gregory, J. (2005b) 'Euripidean Tragedy', in Gregory (2005a) 251–70.
- Griffin, J. (1998) 'The social function of Attic tragedy', *CQ* 48: 39–61.
- Griffin, J. (1999a) (ed.) *Sophocles Revisited* (Oxford).
- Griffin, J. (1999b) 'Sophocles and the democratic city' in Griffin (1999a) 73–94.
- Griffith, M. (1978) 'Aeschylus, Sicily and Prometheus', in Dawe, Diggle, and Easterling (1978) (eds.) 105–39.
- Griffith, M. (2007) '"Telling the tale": a performing tradition from Homer to pantomime', in McDonald and Walton (2007) (eds.) 13–35.

- Griffith, M. (2010) 'Satyr play and tragedy, face to face', in Taplin and Wyles (2010) (eds.) 47–63.
- Griffith, M. and Carter, D.M. (2011) 'Introduction' in Carter (2011a) (ed.) 1–16.
- Griffiths, A. (1995) (ed.) *Stage Directions: Essays in Ancient Drama in Honour of E.W. Handley* (BICS Supplement; London).
- Grote, G. (1851–6) *History of Greece*, 4th ed. 12 vols. (London).
- Guarducci, M. (1929) *Poeti vaganti e conferenzieri dell'eta ellenistica: ricerche di epigrafia greca nel campo della letteratura e del costume* (Atti della Reale Accademia nazionale dei Lincei; Rome).
- Gzella, S. (1971) 'The problem of the fee in Greek choral lyric', *Eos* 59: 189–202.
- Hall, E. (1996a) *Aeschylus. Persians* (Warminster).
- Hall, E. (1996b) 'Is there a polis in Aristotle's Poetics?' in Silk (1996) (ed.) 295–309.
- Hall, E. (1997) 'The sociology of Athenian tragedy', in Easterling (1997) (ed.) 93–126.
- Hall, E. (2002) 'The singing actors of antiquity', in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 3–38.
- Hall, E. (2006) *The Theatrical Cast of Athens: Interactions between Ancient Greek Drama and Society* (Oxford).
- Hall, E. (2007a) 'Tragedy personified', in Kraus et al. (2007) (eds.) 221–56.
- Hall, E. (2007b) 'Greek tragedy 430–380 BC', in Osborne (2007) (ed.) 264–87.
- Hall, E. (2011) 'Antigone and the internationalisation of theatre in antiquity', in Mee and Foley (2011) (eds.) 51–63.
- Hall, E. (2013) *Adventures with Iphigenia in Tauris: A Cultural History of Euripides' Black Sea Tragedy* (Oxford).
- Hall, E., Macintosh, F., and Taplin, O. (2000) (eds.) *Medea in performance 1500–2000* (Oxford).
- Hall, J.M. (2001) 'Contested ethnicities: perceptions of Macedonia within evolving definitions of Greek identity', in Malkin (2001) (ed.) 156–86.
- Hall, J.M. (2002) *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture* (Chicago).
- Hammond, N.G.L. and Griffith, G.T. (1979) *A History of Macedonia: Volume 2. 550–336 BC* (Oxford).
- Hanink, J. (2010a) 'The classical tragedians from Athenian idols to wandering poets', in Gildenhard and Revermann (2010) (eds.) 39–68.
- Hanink, J. (2010b) 'The life of the author in the "letters" of Euripides', *GRBS* 50: 537–64.
- Hanink, J. (2011) 'Aristotle and the tragic theatre in the fourth century BC: a response to Jennifer Wise', *Arethusa* 44: 311–28.
- Harder, A. (1979) 'A new identification in P.Oxy. 2455?', *ZPE* 35: 7–14.
- Harder, A. (1985) *Euripides' Kresphontes and Archelaos: Introduction, text and commentary*, *Mnem. Suppl.* 87 (Leiden).

- Harder, A. (1991) 'Euripides' *Temenus* and *Temenidai*', in Hoffman and Harder (1991) (eds.) 117–35.
- Harder, A., Regtuit, R. F. & Wakker, G. C. (2006) (eds.) *Beyond the canon* (Leuven).
- Harris, E.M. (2002) 'Workshop, Household and Marketplace', in Cartledge et al. (2002) (eds.) 67–99.
- Harris, E.M. and Lewis, D. (2016) 'Introduction: markets in Classical and Hellenistic Greece', in Harris et al. (2016) (eds.) 1–37.
- Harris E.M., Lewis D., and Woolmer M. (2016) (eds.) *The Ancient Greek Economy: Markets, Households, and City States* (Cambridge).
- Harris, H.A. (1964) *Greek Athletes and Athletics* (London).
- Harrison, G.W.M. (2005) (ed.) *Satyr Drama: Tragedy at Play* (Swansea).
- Harvey, D. (2000) 'Phrynichus and his Muses', in Harvey and Wilkins (2000) (eds.) 91–134.
- Harvey, D. and Wilkins, J. (2000) (eds.) *The Rivals of Aristophanes* (Swansea).
- Haslam, M.W. (1975) 'The authenticity of Euripides *Phoenissae* 1–2 and Sophocles, *Electra* 1', *GRBS* 16: 149–74.
- Haslam, M.W. (1991) 'Aiolos' cousin', *ZPE* 88: 297–9. [= Lloyd-Jones (2005) 42–5].
- Hatzopoulos, M.B. (1996) *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings* (Athens and Paris).
- Haupt, M. (1875) 'Index lectionum hibernarum 1862', in *Opuscula* (Leipzig) 207–17.
- Heath, M. (1987) *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy*, (London).
- Heath, M. (1988) 'Receiving the κῶμος: the context and performance of epinician', *AJP* 109: 180–95.
- Heath, M. (1990) 'Aristophanes and his rivals', *G&R* 37: 143–58.
- Heath, M. (2006) 'The social function of tragedy. Clarifications and questions', in Cairns and Liapis (2006) (eds.) 253–82.
- Heath, M. (2009) 'Should there have been a polis in Aristotle's *Poetics*', *CQ* 59: 468–85.
- Heath, M. and Lefkowitz, M. (1991) 'Epinician performance' *CP* 86: 173–91.
- Herington, C.J. (1967) 'Aeschylus in Sicily', *JHS* 87: 74–85.
- Herington, C.J. (1985) *Poetry into Drama: Early Tragedy and the Greek Poetic Tradition* (Berkeley and London).
- Heubeck, A., West, S., and Hainsworth J.B. (1988) *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey. Volume I* (Oxford).
- Hickmann, E., Both, A.A., and Eichmann, R. (2006) (eds.) *Studien zur Musikarchäologie V: Musikarchäologie im Kontext*. (Rahden).
- Hochscheid, H. (2015) *Networks of Stone: Sculpture and Society in Archaic and Classical Athens* (Bern).
- Hodkinson, S. (2009) (ed.) *Sparta: Comparative Approaches* (Swansea).

- Hofmann, H. and Harder, A. (1991) (eds.) *Fragmenta Dramatica: Beiträge zur Interpretation der griechischen Tragikerfragmente und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte* (Göttingen).
- Horden, P. and Purcell, N. (2000) *The Corrupting Sea: A Study of Mediterranean History* (Oxford).
- Hordern, J.H. (2002) *The Fragments of Timotheus of Miletus* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, S. (1982) *Mausolus* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, S. (2009) 'Greek lyric and the politics and sociologies of archaic and classical Greek communities', in F. Budelmann (2009) (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge) 39–57.
- Hornblower, S. and Morgan, C. (2007a) (eds.) *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* (Oxford).
- Hornblower, S. and Morgan, C. (2007b) 'Introduction', in Hornblower and Morgan (2007a) (eds.) 1–43.
- Hubbard, T.K. (2004) 'The dissemination of epinician lyric: pan-hellenism, reperformance, written texts', in Mackie (2004) (ed.) 71–93.
- Hubbard, T.K. (2011) 'The dissemination of Pindar's non-epinician choral lyric', in Athanassaki and Bowie (2011) (eds.) 347–63.
- Huddilston, J.H. (1898) *Greek Tragedy in the Light of Vase Paintings* (New York and London).
- Hugoniot, C., Hurlet, F., and Milanezi, S. (2004) (eds.) *Le Statut de l'Acteur dans l'Antiquité Grecque et Romaine* (Tours).
- Hunter, R.L. (1983) *Eubulus* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R.L. and Rutherford, I. (2009a) (eds.) *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality, and Pan-Hellenism* (Cambridge).
- Hunter, R.L. and Rutherford, I. (2009b) 'Introduction' in Hunter and Rutherford (2009a) (eds.) 1–22.
- Hutchinson, G.O. (2001) *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces* (Oxford).
- Huxley, G. (1965) 'Ion of Chios', *GRBS* 6: 29–46.
- Huys, M. (1997) 'The *Fabulae* of Ps.-Hyginus: a source for the reconstruction of Euripides' lost tragedies?: Part II', *Archiv für Papyrus Forschung und Verwandte Gebiete* 43: 11–30.
- Inwood, B. (2009) (ed.) *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy XXXVII* (Oxford).
- Ippolito, A. (1997) 'De Aeschlyli deperdita fabula quae Αἰτναῖαι inscribitur', *Latinitas* 45: 2–12.
- Jacobson, H. (1983) *The Exagoge of Ezekiel* (Cambridge).
- Jacoby, F. (1947) 'Some remarks on Ion of Chios', *CQ* 41: 1–17.
- Jeffery, L. (1973–4) 'Demiourgoi in the archaic period', *Arch. Class.* 25–5: 319–30.
- Jeffery, L. (1990) *Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries BC*, 2nd ed. (Oxford).

- Jennings, V. and Katsaros, A. (2007) (eds.) *The World of Ion of Chios, Mnem. Suppl.* 288 (Leiden).
- Jones, C.P. (1991) 'Dinner Theatre', in Slater (1991) (ed.) 185–98.
- Jordan, D. (2000) 'A personal letter found in the Athenian Agora', *Hesperia* 69: 91–103.
- Jordan, D. (2007) 'An opisthographic lead tablet from Sicily with a financial document and a curse concerning *choregoi*', in Wilson (2007a) (ed.) 335–50.
- Jouan, F. and Van Looy, H. (1998) *Euripide: Tome VIII, Fragments* (Paris).
- Junker, K. (2011) 'The transformation of Athenian theatre culture around 400 BC', in Taplin and Wyles (2011) (eds.) 131–48.
- Kaimio, M. (1999) 'The citizenship of the theatre-makers in Athens', *WJA* 23: 43–61.
- Kantzios, I. (2005) 'Tyranny and the symposium of Anacreon', *CJ* 100: 227–45.
- Katsaros, A. (2007) 'Staging Empire and other in Ion's Symptotica', in Jennings and Katsaros (2007) (eds.) 217–40.
- Katsouris, A.G. (2005) 'Euripides' *Archelaos*: a re-consideration', in G. Bastianini and A. Casanova (2005) (eds.) *Euripide e papiri* (Florence) 205–26.
- Kerkhof, R. (2001) *Dorische Posse, Epicharm, und Attische Komödie* (Leipzig).
- Kitto, H.D.F. (2011) *Greek Tragedy: A Literary Study*, 3rd edn. with a forward by Edith Hall (London).
- Kivilo, M. (2010) *Early Greek Poets' Lives: The Shaping of the Tradition, Mnem. Suppl.* 322 (Leiden).
- Klee, T. (1918) *Zur Geschichte der gymnischen Agone an griechischen Festen* (Leipzig and Berlin).
- Knox, B. (1954) 'Why is Oedipus called Tyrannos?', *CJ* 3: 97–102. [= Knox (1979) 87–95].
- Knox, B. (1957) *Oedipus at Thebes* (New Haven).
- Knox, B. (1972) 'Aeschylus and the third actor', *AJP* 93: 104–24. [= (1979) 39–55].
- Knox, B. (1979) *Word and Action: Essays on the Ancient Theatre* (Baltimore).
- Koehler, U. (1894) 'Aus dem Leben des Dichters Ion', *Hermes* 29: 156–8.
- Kolb, F. (1979) 'Polis und Theater', in Seeck (1979) (ed.) 504–45.
- König, J. (2010) (ed.) *Greek Athletics* (Edinburgh).
- Koster, W.J.W. (1971) 'De prologo "Archelai" Euripidis', *Mnem.* 24: 88–90.
- Kotlińska-Toma, A. (2015) *Hellenistic Tragedy: Texts, Translations and a Critical Survey* (London).
- Kovacs, D. (1990) 'De Ctesiphonte verna, ut perhibent, Euripidis', *ZPE* 84: 15–18.
- Kovacs, D. (1994) *Euripidea* (Leiden).
- Kovacs, D. (2003) 'Toward a reconstruction of "Iphigenia Aulidensis"', *JHS* 123: 77–103.

- Kowalzig, B. (2005) 'Mapping out *Communitas*: performances of *Theoria* in their sacred and political context', in Elsner and Rutherford (2005) (eds.) 41–72.
- Kowalzig, B. (2008) 'Nothing to do with Demeter? Something to do with Sicily! Theatre and society in the early fifth century West', in Revermann and Wilson (2008) (eds.) 128–57.
- Kowalzig, B. (2013) 'Transcultural chorality: *Iphigenia in Tauris* and Athenian imperial economics in a polytheistic world', in Gagné and Govers Hopman (2013) (eds.) 178–210.
- Kowalzig, B. and Wilson, P. (2013) (eds.) *Dithyramb in Context* (Oxford).
- Kraus, C., Foley, H.P., Goldhill, S., and Elsner, J. (2007) (eds.) *Visualising the Tragic* (Oxford).
- Krumeich, R., Pechstein, N., and Seidensticker B. (1999) *Das griechische Satyrspiel* (Darmstadt).
- Kuch, H. (1993) 'Continuity and change in Greek tragedy under postclassical conditions', in Sommerstein et al. (1993) (ed.) 545–57.
- Kurke, L. (1991) *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca and London).
- La Rosa, V. (1974) 'Le Etnee di Eschilo e l'identificazione di Xouthia', *Archivio Storico per la Sicilia Orientale* 70: 151–63.
- Lamari, A.A. (2015) 'Aeschylus and the beginning of tragic reperformances', *TC* 7:189–206.
- Lämmer, M. (1982–3) 'The so-called Olympic peace in ancient Greece', *Stadion* 8–9: 47–83. [= König (2010) (ed.) 36–60].
- Lane Fox, R. (2008) *Travelling Heroes: Greeks and their Myths in the Epic Age of Homer* (London).
- Larmour, D.H.J. (1999) *Stage and Stadium: Drama and Athletics in Ancient Greece* (Hildesheim).
- Larson, M. S. (2013) *The Rise of Professionalism: Monopolies of Competence and Sheltered Markets*, 2nd edn. (New Brunswick).
- Lattimore, R. L. (1943) 'Aeschylus on the defeat of Xerxes', in Oldfather (1943) 82–93.
- Le Guen, B. (1995) 'Théâtre et cités à l'époque hellénistique: "Mort de la cite" – "Mort du théâtre"?', *REG* 108: 59–90.
- Le Guen, B. (2001) *Les Associations de Technites dionysiaques à l'époque hellénistique. Vol. 1, Corpus documentaire; vol. 2, Synthèse* (Nancy).
- Le Guen, B. (2010a) (ed.) *L'Argent dans les Concours du Monde Grec* (Saint-Denis).
- Le Guen, B. (2010b) 'Les fêtes du théâtre Grec à l'époque Hellenistique', *REG* 123: 495–520.
- Le Guen, B. (2014) 'Theatre, religion, and politics at Alexander's travelling royal court', in Csapo et al. (2014) (eds.) 249–74.

- Lefkowitz, M.R. (1963) 'The first person in Pindar', *Harvard Studies in Philology* 67: 177–253. [= (1991) 1–71].
- Lefkowitz, M.R. (1978) 'The poet as hero: fifth century autobiography and subsequent biographical fiction', *CQ* 28: 459–69. [= (1991) 111–26].
- Lefkowitz, M.R. (1979) 'The Euripides *Vita*', *GRBS* 20: 187–210.
- Lefkowitz, M.R. (1988) 'Who sang Pindar's victory odes?', *AJP* 109: 1–11. [= (1991) 191–201].
- Lefkowitz, M.R. (1991) *First Person Fictions. Pindar's Poetic 'I'* (Oxford).
- Lefkowitz, M.R. (2012) *The Lives of the Greek Poets*, 2nd edn. (London).
- Lesky, A. (1963) *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Bern and Munich).
- Lesky, A. (1972) *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*, 2nd ed. (Göttingen).
- Liapis, V. (2001) 'An ancient hypothesis to *Rhesus*, and *Dicaearchus' Hypotheseis*', *GRBS* 23: 356–67.
- Liapis, V. (2012) *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides* (Oxford).
- Lightfoot, J.L. (2002) 'Nothing to do with the *technitai* of Dionysus?', in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 209–24.
- Lloyd, M. (1994) *Euripides Andromache* (Warminster).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1966) 'Problems of early Greek tragedy: Pratinas, Phrynichus, the Gyges fragment', *Estudios sobre la tragedia Griega. Cuadernos de la Fundación Pastor* 13: 11–33. [= (1990) 225–37].
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1983) *The Justice of Zeus*, 2nd edn. (Berkeley).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1990) *Greek Lyric, Epic, and Tragedy. The Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1991) 'The cousin of Aiolos Hippotades (Stesichorus (?), *P. Oxy.* 3876. Fr. 62)', *ZPE* 87: 297–300. [= (2005) 39–42].
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (2005) *The Further Academic Papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford).
- Lomas, K. (2004) (ed.) *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean* (Leiden and Boston).
- Lopez Férez, J.A. (1998) (ed.) *La Comedia griega y su influencia en la literatura española* (Madrid).
- Lowenstam, S. (1997) 'Talking Vases: the relationship between the Homeric poems and archaic representations of epic myth', *TAPA* 127: 21–76.
- Luppe, W. (1992) 'Resolutions and Chronology in Euripides: the Fragmentary Tragedies by M. Cropp and G. Fick', *Mnem.* 45: 96–8.
- MacDowell, D.M. (1993) 'Foreign birth and Athenian citizenship in Aristophanes', in Sommerstein et al. (1993) (ed.) 359–71.
- MacDowell, D.M. (2000) *Demosthenes. On the False Embassy* (Oration 19) (Oxford).
- Macintosh, F., Michelakis, P. Hall, E., and Taplin, O. (2005) (eds.) *Agamemnon in Performance 458 BC to AD 2004* (Oxford).

- Mackie, C.J. (2004) (ed.) *Oral Performance and its Context*, *Mnem.* Suppl. 248 (Leiden).
- Macleod, C.W. (1982) 'Politics and the *Oresteia*', *JHS* 102: 124–44. [= Lloyd (2007) (ed.) 265–301].
- Maehler, H. (2004) *Bacchylides: A Selection* (Cambridge).
- Maitland, J. (2007) 'Ion of Chios, Sophocles and myth', in Jennings and Katsaros (2007) (eds.) 266–80.
- Malkin, I. (1998) *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley and London).
- Malkin, I. (2001) (ed.) *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Cambridge, MA).
- Malkin, I. (2011) *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Oxford).
- Malkin, I., Constantakopoulou, C., and Panagopoulou K. (2009) (eds.) *Greek and Roman Networks in the Mediterranean* (London).
- Marconi, C. (2012) 'Between performance and identity: the social context of stone theatres in late Classical and Hellenistic Sicily', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 175–207.
- Marek, C. (1984) *Die Proxenie* (Frankfurt).
- Markantonatos, A. and Zimmermann, B. (2012) (eds.) *Crisis on Stage: Tragedy and Comedy in Late Fifth Century Athens* (Berlin).
- Markianos, S.S. (1974) 'The Chronology of the Herodotean Solon', *Historia* 23: 1–20.
- Marow, S. and Nölle, E. (2002) (eds.) *Die Geburt des Theaters in der griechischen Antike* (Mainz).
- Martin, R.P. (1992) 'Hesiod's metanastic poetics', *Ramus* 21: 11–33.
- Martin, R.P. (2006) 'Solon in no man's land', in J.H. Blok and A.P.M.H. Lardinois (2006) (eds.) *Solon of Athens* (Leiden) 157–72.
- Martin, R.P. (2009) 'Read on arrival', in Hunter and Rutherford (eds.) (2009a) 80–104.
- Masson, O. (1992) 'Nouvelles notes d'anthroponymie Grecque', *ZPE* 91: 107–20. [= Masson (2000) 126–39].
- Masson, O. (2000) *Onomastica Graeca Selecta Tome III* (Geneva).
- Mastronarde, D.J. (1994) *Euripides. Phoenissae* (Cambridge).
- Mastronarde, D.J. (2002) *Euripides. Medea* (Cambridge).
- McDonald, M. and Walton, M. (2007) (eds.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek and Roman Theatre* (Cambridge).
- Mee, E.B. and Foley, H.P. (2011) (eds.) *Antigone on the Contemporary World Stage* (Oxford).
- Meier, C. (1993) *The Political Art of Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- Mele, A. (1998) 'Culti e Miti nella storia di Metaponto', in Greco (1998) (ed.) 67–90.
- Meyer, E.A. (2010) *Metics and the Athenian Phialai-inscriptions: A Study in Athenian Epigraphy and Law* (Stuttgart).

- Michelakis, P. (2002) *Achilles in Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- Michelini, A.N. (1989) 'Neophron and Euripides' *Medeia*', *TAPA* 119: 115–35.
- Michelini, A.N. (1999–2000) 'The expansion of myth in late Euripides: *Iphigenia at Aulis*', in Cropp, Lee, and Sansone (1999–2000) (eds.) 41–57.
- Miller, S.G. (2004) *Ancient Greek Athletics* (New Haven).
- Millett, P. (1989) 'Patronage and its avoidance in classical Athens', in Wallace-Hadrill (1989) (ed.) 15–47.
- Mitchell, L. (2007) *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Swansea).
- Moloney, E. (2014) '*Philippus in acie tutior quam in theatro fuit* (Curtius 9.6.25): the Macedonian kings and Greek theatre', in Csapo et al. (2014) (eds.) 231–48.
- Montiglio, S. (2000) 'Wandering Philosophers in Classical Greece', *JHS* 120: 86–105.
- Montiglio, S. (2005) *Wandering in Ancient Greek Culture* (Chicago).
- Moore, W.E. (1970) *The Professions: Roles and Rules* (New York).
- Moreau, A.M. (1992/3) 'La tétralogie des Perses a-t-elle une unite?', in Ghiron-Bistagne et al. (1993) (eds.) 119–44.
- Morgan, K.A. (2003) (ed.) *Popular Tyranny* (Austin).
- Morgan, K.A. (2007) 'Debating patronage: the cases of Argos and Corinth,' in Hornblower and Morgan (2007) (eds.) 213–63.
- Morgan, K.A. (2012) 'A prolegomenon to performance in the West', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 35–55.
- Morris, I. and Raafaub, K. (1997) (eds.) *Democracy 2500: Questions and Challenges* (Boston).
- Morwood, J. (2009) 'Euripides and the demagogues', *CQ* 59: 353–63.
- Mossman, J.M. (1996) 'Waiting for Neoptolemus: the unity of Euripides' *Andromache*', *G&R* 43: 143–56.
- Mossman, J.M. (2011) *Euripides. Medea* (Oxford).
- Murakawa, K. (1957) 'Demiurgos', *Historia* 6: 385–415.
- Murray, O. and Price, S.R.F. (1990) (eds.) *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander* (Oxford).
- Murray, P. and Wilson, P. (2004) (eds.) *Music and the Muses: The Culture of Music in the Classical Athenian City* (Oxford).
- Nafissi, M. (1997) 'Atene e Metaponto: ancora sulla *Melanippe Desmotis* e i Neleidi', *Ostraka* 6: 337–57.
- Nagy, G. (1990) *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore and London).
- Nagy, G. (2003) *Homeric Responses* (Austin).
- Nauck, A. (1900) *Euripidis Tragoediae*, 3rd edn., 3 vols. (Leipzig).
- Nervegna, S. (2013) *Menander in Antiquity: The Contexts of Reception* (Cambridge).

- Nicholson, N.J. (2000) 'Pederastic poets and adult patrons in late archaic lyric', *CW* 93: 235–59.
- Nicholson, N.J. (2005) *Aristocracy and Athletics in Archaic and Classical Greece* (Cambridge).
- Nieberding, K. (1836) *De Ionis Chii Vita, Moris, Studiis Doctrinae* (Leipzig).
- Nielson, T.H. (2002) (ed.) *Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart).
- Niesler, J. (1981) *Proxenos und Proxenie in frühen literarischen und epigraphischen Zeugnissen* (Munich).
- Nietzsche, F.W. (1872) *Die Geburt der Tragödie aus dem Geiste der Musik* (Leipzig).
- Nilsson, M.P. (1951) *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece* (Lund).
- Nobili, C. (2011) 'Threnodic elegy in Sparta', *GRBS* 51: 26–48.
- O'Sullivan, P. (2003) 'Victory statue, victory song: Pindar's agonistic poetics and its legacy', in Phillips and Pritchard (2003) (eds.) 75–100.
- O'Sullivan, P. (2012) 'Dionysos, Polyphemos and the idea of Sicily in Euripides' *Cyclops*', in Davidson and Rosenbloom (2012) (eds.) 169–89.
- Oldfather, W.A. (1943) *Classical Studies in Honor of William Abbott Oldfather* (Urbana).
- Olson, S.D. (2007) *Broken Laughter: Select Fragments of Greek Comedy* (Oxford).
- Osborne, R. (1994) 'Athenian democracy: something to celebrate?', *Dialogos* 1: 48–58. [= (2010) 27–38].
- Osborne, R. (2007) (ed.) *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution: Art, Literature, Philosophy and Politics 430–380 BC* (Cambridge).
- Osborne, R. (2010) *Athens and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge).
- Osborne, R. and Hornblower, S. (1994) (eds.) *Ritual, Finance, Politics* (Oxford).
- Page, D.L. (1936) 'The elegiacs in Euripides' *Andromache*', in Bailey et al. (1936) (eds.) 206–30.
- Page, D.L. (1938) *Euripides. Medea* (Oxford).
- Papenfuss, D. and Strocka, V.M. (2001) (eds.) *Gab es das griechische Wunder? Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Mainz).
- Parke, H. W. (1977) *Festivals of the Athenians* (London).
- Parker, R. (1983) *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion* (Oxford).
- Parker, R. (1998) 'τύπανος: the semantics of a political concept from Archilochus to Aristotle', *Hermes* 126: 145–72.
- Parker, R. (2004) 'New "panhellenic" festivals in Hellenistic Greece', in Schlesier and Zellmann (2004) (eds.) 9–22.
- Parker, R. (2005) *Polytheism and Society at Athens* (Oxford).

- Pelling, C. (1997) (ed.) *Greek Tragedy and the Historian* (Oxford).
- Pettersson, M. (1992) *Cults of Apollo at Sparta: The Hyakinthia, the Gymnopaïdiai and the Karneia* (Stockholm).
- Phillips, D.J., and Pritchard, D.M. (2003) *Sport and Festival in the Ancient Greek World* (Swansea).
- Pickard-Cambridge, A.W. (1962) *Dithyramb, Tragedy and Comedy*, 2nd edn., revised by T.W.L. Webster (Oxford).
- Pleket, H.W. (1974) 'Zur Soziologie des antiken Sports', *Mededelingen van het Nederlands Instituut te Rome* 36: 56–87.
- Pleket, H.W. (1975) 'Games, prizes, athletes and ideology: some aspects of the history of sport in the Greco-Roman world', *Stadion* 1: 49–89. [= König (2010) (ed.) 145–74].
- Podlecki, A.J. (1966) *The Political Background of Aeschylean Tragedy* (Ann Arbor).
- Podlecki, A.J. (1986) 'Polis and monarch in early Attic tragedy', in Euben (1986) (ed.) 76–100.
- Poli-Palladini, L. (2001) 'Some reflections on Aeschylus' *Aetnae(ae)*', *RhM* 144: 287–325.
- Poli-Palladini, L. (2013) *Aeschylus at Gela: An Integrated Approach* (Alessandria).
- Powell, A. (1989) (ed.) *Classical Sparta: Techniques behind her success* (London).
- Power, T. (2010) *The Culture of Kitharôidia* (Washington, DC).
- Pozzi, D.C. and Wickersham, J. M. (1991) (eds.) *Myth and the Polis* (Ithaca).
- Prag, A.J.N.W. (1985) *The Oresteia: Iconographic and Narrative Tradition* (Warminster).
- Prest, W. (1987) (ed.) *The Professions in Early Modern England* (London).
- Pritchard, D.M. (2003) 'Athletics, Education and Participation in Classical Athens', in Phillips and Pritchard (2003) (eds.) 293–349. [Revised in Pritchard 2013, 34–83].
- Pritchard, D.M. (2013) *Sport, Democracy and War in Classical Athens* (Cambridge).
- Raaflaub, K.A. (2003) 'Stick and glue: the function of tyranny in fifth century Athenian democracy', in Morgan (2003) (ed.) 59–93.
- Randall, R.H. (1953) 'The Erechtheum Workmen', *AJA* 58: 199–210.
- Raubitschek, A.E. (1943) 'Greek Inscriptions', *Hesperia* 12: 12–96.
- Rehm, R. (1989) 'Aeschylus in Syracuse: the commerce of tragedy and politics', in Wescoat (1989) (ed.) 31–4.
- Renfrew, C. (1986) 'Introduction', in Renfrew and Cherry (1986) (eds.) 1–18.
- Renfrew, C. and Cherry, J.F. (1986) (eds.) *Peer-Polity Interaction and Socio Political Change* (Cambridge).
- Revermann, M. (2005) 'The "Cleveland Medea" calyx crater and the iconography of ancient Greek theatre', *Theatre Research International* 30: 3–18.

- Revermann, M. (2006a) *Comic Business: Theatricality, Dramatic Technique, and Performance Contexts of Aristophanic Comedy* (Oxford).
- Revermann, M. (2006b) 'The competence of theatre audiences in fifth- and fourth-century Athens', *JHS* 126: 99–124.
- Revermann, M. (2010) 'Situating the gaze of the recipient(s): theatre-related vase painting and their contexts of reception', in Gildenhard and Revermann (2010) (eds.) 69–97.
- Revermann, M. (2014) (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Comedy* (Cambridge).
- Revermann, M. and Wilson, P. (2008) (eds.) *Performance, Iconography, Reception* (Oxford).
- Rhodes, P.J. (2003) 'Nothing to do with democracy: Athenian drama and the polis', *JHS* 123: 104–19.
- Rhodes, P.J. (2011) 'The Dionysia and democracy again', *CQ* 61: 71–4.
- Richardson, N. (2010) *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes and Aphrodite* (Cambridge).
- Ridgeway, W. (1910) *The Origin of Tragedy* (Cambridge).
- Ridgeway, W. (1926) 'Euripides in Macedon', *CA* 20: 1–19.
- Ritchie, W. (1964) *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides* (Cambridge).
- Robert, C. (1881) *Bild und Lied* (Berlin).
- Robertson, D.S. (1923) 'Euripides and Tharyps', *CR* 37: 58–60.
- Robertson, N. (1980) 'The Dorian migration and Corinthian ritual', *CP* 75: 1–22.
- Rocconi, E. (2006) 'Women players in ancient Greece: the context of the symposia and the social-cultural position of psaltirai and auletrides in the classical world', in Hickmann et al. (2006) (eds.) 335–44.
- Roochnik, D. (1996) *Of Art and Wisdom: Plato's Understanding of Techne* (Philadelphia).
- Rose, P.W. (1995) 'Historicising Sophocles' Ajax', in Goff (1995) (ed.) 59–90.
- Roselli, D.K. (2011) *Theatre of the People: Spectators and Society in Ancient Athens* (Austin).
- Rosenbloom, D. (2011) 'The panhellenism of Athenian tragedy', in Carter (2011a) (ed.) 353–81.
- Rosenbloom, D. (2012) 'Athenian drama and democratic political culture', in Davidson and Rosenbloom (2012) (eds.) 270–99.
- Rothwell, K.S. (2007) *Nature, Culture, and the Origins of Greek Comedy: A Study of Animal Choruses* (Cambridge).
- Rusten, J.S. (1980) 'The return of the Heracleidae', *ZPE* 40: 39–42.
- Rusten, J.S. (1982) 'Dicaearchus and the *Tales of Euripides*', *GRBS* 23: 357–67.
- Rusten, J.S. (2006) 'Who "invented" comedy? The ancient candidates for the origins of comedy and the visual evidence', *AJP* 127: 37–66.

- Rutherford, I. (1998) 'Theoria as theatre: Pilgrimage in Greek drama', in Cairns (1998) (ed.) 131–56.
- Rutherford, I. (2001) *Pindar's Paean: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford).
- Rutherford, I. (2004) 'χορός εἰς ἐκ τῆσδε τῆς πολέως . . . (Xen. Mem. 3.3.12) State-pilgrimage and song dance in Athens', in Murray and Wilson (2004) (eds.) 67–90.
- Rutherford, I. (2005) 'Down-stream to the cat goddess: Herodotus on Egyptian pilgrimage', in Elsner and Rutherford (2005) (eds.) 131–50.
- Rutherford, I. (2007a) 'Theoria and Theatre at Samothrace: the Dardanos of Dymas', in Wilson (2007a) (ed.) 279–93.
- Rutherford, I. (2007b) 'Network Theory and Theoric Networks', *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22: 23–37 [= Malkin et al. (2009) (eds.) 24–38]
- Rutherford, I. (2013) *State Pilgrims and Sacred Observers in Ancient Greece: A Study of Theōriā and Theōroi* (Cambridge).
- Sanguinetti Katz, G., Golini, V., and Pietropaolo, D. (2001) (eds.) *Theatre and the Visual Arts* (New York, Ottawa and Toronto).
- Scaparro, M., de Septis, F., Rossetto, P.C., and Sartorio, G.P. (1994) (eds.) *Teatri greci e romani*, 3 vols. (Rome).
- Schachter, A. (1994) *Cults of Boiotia. Vol. 3 Potnia to Zeus*, BICS Suppl. 38.3 (London).
- Schachter, A. (1998) 'Simonides' elegy on Plataia: the occasion of its performance', *ZPE* 123: 25–30.
- Schachter, A. and Slater, W.J. (2007) 'A proxeny decree from Koroneia, Boiotia, in honour of Zotion, son of Zotion of Ephesus', *ZPE* 163: 81–95.
- Schlesier, R. and Zellmann, U. (2004) (eds.) *Mobility and Travel in the Mediterranean from Antiquity to the Middle Ages* (Münster and London).
- Schwartz, J.D. (1986) 'Human action and political action in *Oedipus Tyrannos*', in Euben (1986) (ed.) 183–209.
- Scodel, R. (2001) 'The poet's career, the rise of tragedy, and Athenian cultural hegemony', in Papenfuss and Strocka (2001) (eds.) 215–27.
- Scodel, R. (2003) 'The politics of Sophocles' *Ajax*', *Scripta Classica Israelica* 22: 31–42.
- Scott, M. (2010) *Delphi and Olympia: The Spatial Politics of Panhellenism in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (Cambridge).
- Scullion, S. (2002) 'Tragic dates', *CQ* 52: 81–101.
- Scullion, S. (2003) 'Euripides and Macedon, or the silence of the *Frogs*', *CQ* 53: 389–400.
- Scullion, S. (2006) 'The opening of Euripides' *Archelaus*', in Cairns and Liapis (2006) (eds.) 185–200.
- Seaford, R. (1982) 'The date of Euripides' *Cyclops*', *JHS* 102: 161–72.
- Seaford, R. (1998) *The Cyclops of Euripides*, 2nd edn. (Bristol).

- Seaford, R. (2000) 'The social function of Attic tragedy: a response to Jasper Griffin', *CQ* 50: 30–44.
- Seaford, R. (2003) 'Tragic Tyranny', in Morgan (2003) (ed.) 95–115.
- Seaford, R. (2004) *Money and the Early Greek Mind* (Cambridge).
- Seaford, R. (2011) 'Response to Wilson, Carter and Duncan', in Carter (2011a) (ed.) 85–91.
- Seeck, G.-A. (1979) (ed.) *Das Griechische Drama* (Darmstadt).
- Shapiro, H.A. (1993) 'Hipparchus and the rhapsodes', in Dougherty and Kurke (1993) (eds.) 92–107.
- Shear, J.L. (2003) 'Prizes from Athens: the list of Panathenaic prizes and the sacred oil', *ZPE* 142: 87–108.
- Sider, D. (1980) 'Plato's *Symposium* as Dionysian Festival', *QUCC* 4: 41–56.
- Sifakis, G.M. (1967) *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama* (London).
- Sifakis, G.M. (1995) 'The one-actor rule in Greek tragedy', in Griffiths (1995) (ed.) 13–24.
- Sifakis, G.M. (2002) 'Looking for the actor's art in Aristotle' in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 148–64.
- Silk, M.S. (1996) (ed.) *Tragedy and the Tragic: Greek Theatre and Beyond* (Oxford).
- Slater, N.W. (1985) 'Vanished players: two classical reliefs and theatre history', *GRBS* 26: 333–44.
- Slater, N.W. (1993) 'Three problems in the history of drama', *Phoenix* 47: 189–212.
- Slater, W.J. (1991) (ed.) *Dining in a Classical Context* (Ann Arbor).
- Small, J.P. (2003) *The Parallel Worlds of Classical Art and Text* (Cambridge).
- Small, J.P. (2005) 'Pictures of tragedy', in Gregory (2005a) (ed.) 103–18.
- Smith, D.G. (2012) 'Sicily and the Identities of Xuthus: Stesichorus, Aeschylus' *Aetnaeae*, and Euripides' *Ion*', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 112–36.
- Smith, R.R.R. (2007) 'Pindar, athletes and the early Greek statue habit', in Hornblower, and Morgan (2007) (eds.) 83–139.
- Snodgrass, A. (1986) 'Interaction by design: the Greek city state', in Renfrew and Cherry (1986) (eds.) 47–58.
- Snodgrass, A. (1998) *Homer and the Artists: Text and Picture in Early Greek Art* (Cambridge).
- Sommerstein, A.H. (1982) *Aristophanes. Clouds* (Warminster).
- Sommerstein, A.H. (1987a) *Aristophanes. Birds* (Warminster).
- Sommerstein, A.H. (1987b) 'Phrynichus the dancer', *Phoenix* 41: 189–90.
- Sommerstein, A.H. (1989) *Aeschylus. Eumenides* (Cambridge).
- Sommerstein, A.H. (1996) *Aristophanes. Frogs* (Warminster).
- Sommerstein, A.H. (1998) 'The theatre audience, the *demos* and the *Suppliants* of Aeschylus', in Lopez F3rez (1998) (ed.) 43–62. [= (2010a) 118–42].

- Sommerstein, A.H. (2003) (ed.) *Shards from Kolonos: Studies in Sophoclean Fragments* (Bari).
- Sommerstein, A.H. (2008) *Aeschylus. Fragments* (Cambridge, MA).
- Sommerstein, A.H. (2010a) *The Tangled Ways of Zeus* (Oxford).
- Sommerstein, A.H. (2010c) 'Notes on Aeschylean Fragments', *Prometheus* 36: 193–212.
- Sommerstein, A.H. (2012) 'The Persian war tetralogy of Aeschylus', in Davidson and Rosenbloom (2012) (eds.) 95–107.
- Sommerstein, A.H., Fitzpatrick, D., and Talboy, T.H. (2006) *Sophocles. Selected Fragmentary Plays Volume I* (Oxford).
- Sommerstein, A.H., Halliwell, S., Henderson, J., and Zimmermann, B. (1993) (eds.) *Tragedy Comedy and the Polis* (Bari).
- Sommerstein, A.H. and Talboy, T.H. (2012) *Sophocles. Selected Fragmentary Plays Volume II* (Oxford).
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1997) 'Medea at a shifting distance: images and Euripidean Tragedy', in Clauss and Johnston (1997) (eds.) 253–96.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (2003) *Tragedy and Athenian Religion* (Lanham).
- Stafford, E. (2012) *Herakles* (London).
- Stanford, W.B. (1937/8) 'Traces of Sicilian Influence in Aeschylus', *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy* 44: 229–40.
- Steiner, D. (1986) *The Crown of Song: Metaphor in Pindar* (London).
- Steiner, D. (1998) 'Moving images: fifth-century victory monuments and the athlete's allure', *CA* 17: 123–50.
- Stern, D.T. and Arnold, L. (2005) 'What is medical professionalism?', in Stern (2005) (ed.) *Measuring Medical Professionalism* (Oxford) 15–37.
- Stevens, A. (2007) 'Ion of Chios: tragedy as commodity and Athenian exchange', in Jennings and Katsaros (2007) (eds.) 243–65.
- Stevens, P.T. (1956) 'Euripides and the Athenians', *JHS* 76: 87–94.
- Stevens, P.T. (1971) *Euripides. Andromache* (Oxford).
- Stewart, A. (1971) *Attica: Studies in Athenian Sculpture of the Hellenistic Age* (London).
- Stewart, E.J. (2016a) 'Evidence for a theatre dynasty: the elder Carcinus, the young Xenocles, and the sons of Carcinus in Aristophanes', *Philologus* 105: 1–18.
- Stewart, E.J. (2016b) 'Professionalism and the poetic persona in archaic Greece', *CCJ* 62: 200–223.
- Stewart, E.J. (2017) '"There's nothing worse than athletes": Criticism of Athletics and Professionalism in the archaic and classical periods', *Nikephoros* 27: 155–76.
- Stewart, E.J. (forthcoming) 'Ion of Chios in Sparta and the work of a wandering poet', online copy <http://www.academia.edu/25832251>.

- Storey, I.C. (2003) *Eupolis: Poet of Old Comedy* (Oxford).
- Sutton, D.F. (1983) 'A possible subject for Aeschylus' "Dike Play"', *ZPE* 51: 19–24.
- Sutton, D.F. (1987) 'The theatrical families of Athens', *AJP* 108: 9–26.
- Svarlien, D.A. (1990) 'Epicharmus and Pindar at Hieron's court', *Kokalos* 36–7: 103–10.
- Svenbro, J. (1976) *La Parole et le Marbre: aux Origines de la Poétique Grecque* (Lund).
- Swift, L.A. (2010) *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric* (Oxford).
- Taplin, O. (1977) *The Stagecraft of Aeschylus* (Oxford).
- Taplin, O. (1978) *Greek Tragedy in Action* (London).
- Taplin, O. (1993) *Comic Angels and Other Approaches to Greek Drama through Vase Painting* (Oxford).
- Taplin, O. (1997) 'The pictorial record', in Easterling (1997) (ed.) 69–90.
- Taplin, O. (1998) 'Narrative variation in vase painting and tragedy: the example of Dirke', *AK* 41: 33–9.
- Taplin, O. (1999) 'Spreading the word through performance', in Goldhill and Osborne (1999) (eds.) 33–57.
- Taplin, O. (2006) 'Aeschylus' *Persai*: the entry of tragedy into the celebration culture of the 470s?', in Cairns and Liapis (2006) (eds.) 1–10.
- Taplin, O. (2007) *Pots and Plays: Interactions between Tragedy and Greek Vase Painting of the Fourth Century BC* (Los Angeles).
- Taplin, O. (2009) 'Hector's helmet glinting in a fourth century tragedy', in Goldhill and Hall (2009) (eds.) 251–63.
- Taplin, O. (2012) 'How was Athenian tragedy played in the Greek West?', in Bosher (2012a) (ed.) 226–50.
- Taplin, O. and Wyles, R. (2010) (eds.) *The Pronomos Vase and its Context* (Oxford).
- Taylor, C. and Vlassopoulos, K. (2015) (eds.) *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World* (Oxford).
- Tell, H. (2007) 'Sages at the games: intellectual displays and dissemination of wisdom in ancient Greece', *CA* 26: 249–75.
- Tell, H. (2011) *Plato's Counterfeit Sophists* (Washington, DC).
- Thomas, R. (2007) 'Fame, memorial and choral poetry: the origins of epinician poetry—an historical study', in Hornblower and Morgan (2007) (eds.) 141–66.
- Trendall, A.D. (1989) *Red Figure Vases of South Italy and Sicily: A Handbook* (New York).
- Trendall, A.D. and Webster, T.B.L. (1971) *Illustrations of Greek Drama* (London).
- Vahtikari, V. (2014) *Tragedy Performances Outside Athens in the Late Fifth and the Fourth Centuries BC* (Helsinki).

- Valerio, F. (2013) *Ione di Chio: Frammenti Elegiaci e Melici* (Bologna).
- Van Leeuwen, J. (1890) 'Quaestiones ad Historiam Scenicam pertinentes', *Mnem.* 18: 68–75.
- Vanderpool, E. (1982) (ed.) *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History, and Topography*, *Hesperia* Suppl. 19 (Princeton).
- Vassallo, S. (2012) 'The Theatre of Montagna dei Cavalli–Hippana', in Boshier (2012a) (ed.) 208–25.
- Vernant, J.-P. (1972a) 'Le moment historique de la tragédie en Grèce: quelques conditions sociales et psychologiques', in Vernant and Vidal-Naquet (1972) 13–17.
- Vernant, J.-P. (1972b) 'Tensions et ambiguïtés dans la tragédie grecque', in Vernant and Vidal-Naquet (1972) 21–40.
- Vernant, J.-P. (1986) 'Le dieu de la fiction tragique', in Vernant and Vidal-Naquet (1986) 17–24.
- Vernant, J.-P. and Vidal-Naquet, P. (1972) *Mythe et Tragédie en Grèce Ancienne* (Paris).
- Vernant, J.-P. and Vidal-Naquet, P. (1986) *Mythe et Tragédie Deux* (Paris).
- Visvardi, E. (2011) 'Pity and panhellenic politics: choral emotion in Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Trojan Women*', in Carter (2011a) (ed.) 269–91.
- Vlassopoulos, K. (2013) *Greeks and Barbarians* (Cambridge).
- Von Reden, S. (1995) 'Deceptive readings: poetry and its value reconsidered', *CQ* 45: 30–50.
- Voza, G. (2001) 'Nuove ricerche sul teatro greco di Siracusa', in Basile, C. and Di Natale, A. (2001) (eds.) *La Sicilia antica nei rapporti con l'Egitto* (Syracuse) 207–10.
- Walbank, M.B. (1978) *Athenian Proxeny of the Fifth Century BC* (Toronto and Sarasota).
- Walcot, P. (1976) *Greek Drama in its Theatrical and Social Context* (London).
- Wallace, M.B. (1970) 'Early Greek "Proxenoï"', *Phoenix* 24: 189–208.
- Wallace, R.W. and Harris, E.M. (1996) (eds.) *Transitions to Empire in Greco-Roman History 360–146 BC* (Norman).
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (1989) (ed.) *Patronage in Ancient Society* (London and New York).
- Webster, T.B.L. (1936) 'Sophocles and Ion of Chios', *Hermes* 71: 263–74.
- Webster, T.B.L. (1948) 'South Italian vases and Attic drama', *CQ* 42: 15–27.
- Webster, T.B.L. (1954) 'Fourth century Tragedy and poetics', *Hermes* 82: 294–308.
- Webster, T.B.L. (1967) *The Tragedies of Euripides* (London).
- Wescoat, B.D. (1989) (ed.) *Syracuse, the Fairest Greek City* (Rome).
- West, M.L. (1966) *Hesiod. Theogony* (Oxford).
- West, M.L. (1970) 'Melica', *CQ* 20: 205–15.
- West, M.L. (1974) *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin).

- West, M.L. (1975) 'Cynaethus's Hymn to Apollo', *CQ* 25: 116–70. [= (2011a) 329–43].
- West, M.L. (1985) 'Ion of Chios', *BICS* 32: 71–8. [= (2013c) 424–36].
- West, M.L. (1989) 'The chronology of early Attic Tragedy', *CQ* 39: 251–4. [= (2013b) 151–6].
- West, M.L. (1992) *Ancient Greek Music* (Oxford).
- West, M.L. (1997) *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).
- West, M.L. (1999) 'The invention of Homer', *CQ* 49: 364–82. [= (2011a) 408–36].
- West, M.L. (2000) 'Iliad and Aethiopsis on the stage: Aeschylus and son', *CQ* 50: 338–52. [= (2013b) 227–49].
- West, M.L. (2005) 'Odyssey and Argonautica', *CQ* 55: 39–64. [= (2011a) 277–312].
- West, M.L. (2011a) *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought. Volume I: Epic* (Oxford).
- West, M.L. (2011b) 'Magnes of Smyrna: a Greek poet at the court of Gyges', in West (2011a) 344–52.
- West, M.L. (2013a) *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics* (Oxford).
- West, M.L. (2013b) *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought. Volume II: Lyric and Drama* (Oxford).
- West, M.L. (2013c) *Hellenica: Selected Papers on Greek Literature and Thought. Volume III: Philosophy, Music and Metre, Literary Byways, Varia* (Oxford).
- West, S. (1974) 'Satyrus: Peripatetic or Alexandrian', *GRBS* 15: 284–5.
- Whitby, M. (1998) 'An international symposium? Ion of Chios fr. 27 and the margins of the Delian League', in Dąbrowa (1998) (ed.) 207–24.
- Whitehead, D. (1975) 'Aristotle the metic', *PCPS* 21: 94–9.
- Whitehead, D. (1977) *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic* (Cambridge).
- Wijma, S.M. (2014) *Embracing the Immigrant: The Participation of Metics in Athenian Polis Religion (5th–4th century BC)* (Stuttgart).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1875) *Analecta Euripidea* (Berlin).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1895) *Euripides* Herakles, 2 volumes (Berlin).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1897) 'Die Perser des Aischylos', *Hermes* 32: 382–98.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1903) *Timotheos: Die Perser: Aus einem Papyrus von Abusir* (Leipzig).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1922) *Pindaros* (Berlin).
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1927) 'Lesefrüchte', *Hermes* 62: 276–98. [= (1962) 431–53].
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von (1962) *Kleine Schriften IV* (Berlin).

- Wiles, D. (1997) *Tragedy in Athens: Performance Space and Theatrical Meaning* (Cambridge).
- Willi, A. (2008) *Sikelismos: Sprache, Literatur und Gesellschaft im griechischen Sizilien* (8.-5. Jh. v. Chr.) (Basel).
- Wilson, N.G. (1999) 'Travelling actors in the fifth century?', *CQ* 49: 625.
- Wilson, N.G. (2007) *Aristophanea. Studies on the text of Aristophanes* (Oxford).
- Wilson, P. (1996) 'Tragic rhetoric: the use of tragedy and the tragic in the fourth century BC', in Silk (1996) (ed.) 310–32.
- Wilson, P. (1999) 'The aulos in Athens', in Goldhill and Osborne (1999) (eds.) 58–95.
- Wilson, P. (2000) *The Athenian Institution of the Khoregia* (Cambridge).
- Wilson, P. (2002) 'The musicians among the actors', in Easterling and Hall (2002) (eds.) 39–68.
- Wilson, P. (2004) 'Athenian Strings', in Murray and Wilson (2004) (eds.) 269–306.
- Wilson, P. (2007a) (ed.) *The Greek Theatre and Festivals* (Oxford).
- Wilson, P. (2007b) 'Sicilian Choruses' in Wilson (2007a) (ed.) 351–77.
- Wilson, P. (2007c) 'Pronomos and Potamon: two pipers and two epigrams', *JHS* 127: 141–9.
- Wilson, P. (2008) 'Costing the Dionysia', in Revermann and Wilson (2008) (eds.) 88–127.
- Wilson, P. (2009a) 'Tragic honours and the democracy: neglected evidence for the politics of the Athenian Dionysia', *CQ* 59: 8–24.
- Wilson, P. (2009b) 'Thamyris the Thracian: the archetypal wandering poet?' in Hunter and Rutherford (2009a) (eds.) 46–79.
- Wilson, P. (2010) 'How did the Athenian demes fund their theatre?', in Le Guen (2010a) (ed.) 37–82.
- Wilson, P. (2011) 'The glue of democracy? Tragic structure and finance', in Carter (2011) (ed.) 19–43.
- Wilson, P. and Hartwig, A. (2009) 'IG I³ 102 and the tradition of proclaiming honours at the tragic *agon* of the Athenian city Dionysia', *ZPE* 169: 17–27.
- Winkler, J. (1990) 'The ephebes' song: *tragoidia* and *polis*', in Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.) 20–62.
- Winkler, J. and Zeitlin, F.I. (1990) (eds.) *Nothing to do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context* (Princeton).
- Wise, J. (2008) 'Tragedy as an "augury of a happy life"', *Arethusa* 41: 381–410.
- Woodbury, L. (1968) 'Pindar and the mercenary Muse', *TAPA* 99: 527–42.
- Woodbury, L. (1985) 'Ibycus and Polycrates', *Phoenix* 39: 193–220.
- Wright, M. (2009) 'Literary prizes and literary criticism in antiquity', *CA* 28: 138–77.

- Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. (1979) 'The influence of rhetoric on fourth century tragedy', *CQ* 29: 66–76.
- Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. (1980) *Studies in Fourth Century Tragedy* (Athens).
- Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. (2012) 'The *Archelaus* of Euripides: reconstruction and motifs', in Davidson and Rosenbloom (2012) (eds.) 108–26.
- Xanthakis-Karamanos, G. and Mimidou, E. (2014) 'The Aeolus of Euripides: concepts and motifs', *BICS* 57: 49–60.
- Young, D.C. (1968) *Three Odes of Pindar: A Literary Study of Pythian 11, Pythian 3 and Olympian 7* (Leiden).
- Young, D.C. (1984) *The Olympic Myth of Greek Amateur Athletics* (Chicago).
- Zaccagnini, C. (1983) 'Patterns of mobility among ancient near eastern craftsman', *JNES* 42: 245–64.
- Zacharia, K. (2003) 'Sophocles and the West: the evidence of the fragments', in Sommerstein (2003) (ed.) 57–76.
- Zeitlin, F.I. (1986) 'Thebes: the theatre of self, and society in Athenian drama', in Euben (1986) (ed.) 104–41. [= Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.) 130–67].
- Zeitlin, F.I. (1990) 'Playing the other: theatre, theatricality and the feminine', in Winkler and Zeitlin (1990) (eds.) 63–86.
- Zeitlin, F.I. (1993) 'Staging Dionysus between Thebes and Athens', in Carpenter and Faraone (1993) (eds.) 147–82.
- Zielinski, T. (1922) 'De Alcmeonis Corinthii fabula Euripidea', *Mnem.* 50: 305–27.
- Zielinski, T. (1925) *Tragodumenon Libri Tres* (Cracow).

Index

- Abdera 38, 43
 Acestor 78, 83–4, 87, 218–20
 Achaëus I of Eretria, tragic poet 77, 83, 87–9, 206, 208, 211
 Achaëus II of Syracuse, tragic poet 76, 83, 215
 Achilles 23, 140–2, 201, 209
 actors:
 acting ‘icons’ 170, 173
 actor’s interpolations 134
 actors’ prize 171–2
 as ambassadors 167, 188–9
 Athenian citizens 65
 delivery 173–6
 fees 192
 images of actors in art 172–3
 non-Athenians 73, 75, 77, 82, 86, 211, 214–15, 218, 220
 professionalism 9, 169–77
 relationship with poets 174–5
 reperformances by actors 139, 177–8
 travels 9, 170, 180, 183–4, 188, 190–4
 Aeacids 21–2, 141–4, *see also* Aegina
 Aegina 21–2, 34, 40, 43, 84, 141–4, 189, 220
 Aegyptus 120, 132–4, *see also* Egypt
 Aeolian Islands 148–9, 155, 157
 Aeolus, brother of Boeotus 145–50, 155
 Aeolus, son of Hellen 29, 120, 145–50
 Aeolus, son of Hippotes 148–50
 Aeschines 69, 175, 189, 220
 Aeschylus:
 actors 7, 63, 77, 211
 Aetnaeae 30, 103, 105–8, 115, 205, 223
 biographical tradition 44, 103–5, 126, 128, 131
 depictions of plays in art 156–7
 Eumenides 22–4, 106, 108, 113, 137, 156–7, 202
 Isthmian Competitors 30, 89, 202
 in Sicily 7, 9, 24, 54, 78, 81, 97, 103–5, 131, 162, 223
 Glaucus of Potniae 112–14, 204
 Libation Bearers 154, 156–7, 202
 Persians 23–4, 109–15, 177, 206, 223
 Phineus 24, 112–14, 208
 reception 163, 178–9
 relationship with
 Epicharmus 99–100, 103
 reperformances 59, 177
 settings of tragedies 201–9
 Trojan trilogy 23, 26, 209
 Aetna 101–8, 111, 119–20
 Aetolia 31, 204
 Agamemnon 154, 208
 Agathon, tragic poet 68, 89, 130
 Agen, *see* Python
 Ajax 23, 142, 208–10
 Alcaeus 43, 52, 56
 Alcman 43–4, 47, 49–50, 52–3
 Alexander I, king of Macedonia 60, 76, 123
 Alexander III (the great), king of Macedonia 9, 33, 78, 82, 124, 181, 184–9, 191–3, 205, 221
 Alexis 75, 215, 219, 220
 Anacreon 43, 47–8, 56, 63, 103, 212
 Antiochus, historian 146–7, 151
 Antiphon, tragic poet 178, 189–90, 204
 Apollo 49–51, 105, 119, 121, 143, 182, 192
 Apollodorus, comic poet 215
 Apollodorus, mythographer 29–30, 124
 Apollodorus, tragic poet 74, 83, 219
 Arcesilaus IV, tyrant of Cyrene 119–20
 Archelaus, hero 120–6, 135–8
 Archelaus, king of Macedonia 75–6, 103, 117, 123, 125–30, 137, 158, 190
 Archias, actor 75, 215, 220
 Archilochus 10, 43, 54, 56, 147
 Argonauts 20, 28, 113–14, 119, 201, 207
 Argos:
 Argive performers 51, 78, 217
 Danaids 28, 132
 Heraclids 21–2, 118–19, 121–3, 135–8
 festivals and performances 43, 140, 184
 in tragedy 26, 144, 202–3
 Arion 43, 54, 60, 84, 96, 183
 Aristarchus, grammarian 53, 133–4

- Aristarchus, tragic poet 78, 83, 94, 216
 Aristias, tragic poet 76, 83, 94, 96,
 206, 216
 Aristodemus, tragic actor 75, 167, 175,
 188, 191, 215
 Aristodemus, Heraclid 80, 118, 119
 Aristophanes:
 Acharnians 28, 65, 68–9, 77, 86,
 214–15, 219–20
 biographical tradition 86–7
 Birds 101–3, 212–13, 218, 222
 Clouds 59, 65, 71, 152, 178
 Frogs 87, 109, 120, 130, 132–4, 137–8,
 156, 174, 178, 216, 219, 222
 Lysistrata 151
 Peace 87, 152, 211
 performance at Eleusis 182
 references to actors 172
 Wasps 48, 78, 211, 217–18
 Wealth 219
 Women of the Thesmophoria
 151, 184
 Aristotle:
 on poets in Sparta 52
 Poetics 89, 95–6, 98, 163, 165–6,
 175, 177
 Politics 84, 125, 129
 Rhetoric 130, 171, 174, 190
 stay in Athens 5, 38, 78–9
 views on tragedy 5, 163, 165–6,
 170, 177
 artisans 35, 37
 artists of Dionysus 13, 168–9, 170, 186,
 188, 191
 see also *technitai*
 Asclepiades, mythographer 133, 149
 Astydamos 85, 89, 163, 209, 213
asulia 191
 Athamas 29–30
 Athenodorus, actor 191
 Athens:
 general visitors to Athens 34–9, 40,
 43, 66–9, 140
 non-citizen performers in
 Athens 69–91, 188–9, 211–21
 tragedy and Athens 1–8, 11, 13, 22–6,
 105, 108–13, 136–7, 152, 161–6,
 177–8, 189, 192, 197, 202–3
 see also democracy, *dēmos*, festivals,
 metics, non-citizens, politics,
 theatres
 athletes 34, 39–42, 58, 61, 186
 Attica, see Athens
 audiences:
 of drama 2–11, 13, 16, 19, 23, 27,
 31–2, 65–72, 86–7, 93–4, 108,
 114–15, 138, 141, 157, 161–5, 170,
 174, 176, 183, 193–7
 of epic, lyric and music 45–6, 55, 57,
 59–64, 79–80, 84
 aulos players 70–3, 77–9, 82, 84–6, 91,
 95, 171, 212, 214–15, 217–18
 Babylon 17, 82, 186, 205
 Bacchylides 43, 50, 54, 60, 81, 88, 90,
 100–1, 114, 151, 211
 biographical tradition, see Aeschylus,
 Aristophanes, Euripides and
 Sophocles
 Black Sea 1, 21, 24, 73–5, 142, 186, 206,
 208, 212
 Boeotia 26, 29–30, 40, 73, 113, 147–8,
 150, 203, 214
 Calydon 204
 Carcinus I, tragic poet 172, 218, 223
 Carcinus II, tragic poet 85, 178, 189,
 203–5, 209, 223
 Caria 81, 184, 186, 189, 205
 Carnea, festival 49, 50–1, 119, 185
 Chaeremon 177–8, 204, 209
 Chalcis 7, 43, 61, 77, 167, 185, 192,
 see also Euboea, Euius, and
 Mynniscus
 Chios 43, 45, 52, 74, 79, 83
chorēgoi 69–70, 97, 181
 choruses 34, 68, 100, 165, 174–5
 Athens 25, 65, 69–70, 77, 82, 84,
 87, 91, 131, 211–12, 214–15,
 217–18
 Delos 46, 57
 dramatic choruses 31, 59, 86, 106–9,
 157, 185, 204, 205
 epinician and choruses 100
 images of choruses in art 172–3
 Peloponnese 49, 94–5, 184
 Sicily 97–8, 105
 Sparta 25, 49–51, 53–5
 chorus instructors 171
 chorus leaders, see *chorēgoi*
 Cilicia 74, 219–20
 Clazomenae 43
 Comedy:
 audience 65, 86

- comic performers 70, 73–5, 79, 82, 86,
171–3, 178, 190, 211, 213–15,
217–18, 220–1, 222–3
depictions of comedy in art 153, 184
on lyric and lyric poets 101–2,
212–13
on tragedy and tragic performers 78,
87, 127, 131, 152, 216, 218–19
outside Attica 71, 95–9, 182, 184, 197
Colophon 43, 45, 53, 54
Cratinus 50, 52, 70, 99, 174
Cresphontes 118
Crete 24, 201
Croesus 47, 52–3
Cyme 45, 52, 56
Cyrene 22, 119, 185
- Deinomenids 100, 111, 120, *see also*
Gelon and Hieron
- Delos 43, 46, 57, 70, 81, 167–8, 181, 191
Delphi 30–1, 43, 49, 54, 61, 68, 90, 105,
108, 110, 141–4, 169, 177–8, 182,
191–2, 204
democracy 3–5, 42, 66, 98, 105, 109, 137,
163–7, 180, 183
dēmos 6, 23, 180
Demosthenes 69, 124, 152, 175, 189,
190, 217, 220
Dicaearchus 129, 133, 178, 216
Diodorus Siculus 110, 124, 146–50, 180,
182–3, 186, 189–90
Dion, city 130–1, 190, 218
Dionysia, festival 3–5, 9, 11, 65–74,
76–7, 82, 85, 90, 94, 96–7, 114, 131,
137, 139, 156–7, 166–8, 173, 180–1,
185, 187, 190–1, 197, 211–18, 220–1
Dionysius, comic poet 74–5, 213
Dionysius I, tyrant of Syracuse 74–6, 79,
83, 87–9, 125, 181, 183, 189–90,
193, 209, 215
Dionysius II, tyrant of Syracuse 189
Dionysus, god 23, 33, 80–1, 95, 109, 169,
172, 208
Diphilus 74–5, 79, 213, 215
dithyramb 48, 50, 69–70, 87, 96,
111, 183
poets 15, 48, 73, 75, 77–8, 84, 86,
211–15, 217–18
Dorians 55, 76, 98, 107, 145, 151
Dorian invention of tragedy 44,
95–7, 216
Dorian migration 118–120, 126
- Egypt 13, 17, 27, 43, 48, 133, 187, 205
Eleusis 23, 31, 70, 78, 81, 182, 203
Emmenids 98, 100
Empedocles I, philosopher 38–9
Empedocles II, poet 84, 181–2
epic cycle, *see* epic poetry
epic poetry 45, 47, 130, 142, 171, *see also*
Homer
Epicharmus 78, 98–100
Epirus 30, 140–4, 150, 159, 191, 217
Eretria 60, 77, 83, 88, 167, *see also*
Achaëus I and Euboea
Ethiopia 28, 206
Euboea 43, 73, 77, 82, 90, 167, 185, 188,
see also Chalcis and Eretria
Euenus 39, 212
Euus 77, 82, 212
Eupolis 39, 68, 78, 95, 151, 218, 220
Euripides:
Aeolus 117, 145, 148–52, 155–7,
177, 205
Andromache 30, 139–44, 152,
157–8, 208
Andromeda 28, 136, 206
Antiope 146, 155–6, 203
Archelaus 9, 30, 76, 81, 117, 120–30,
132–9, 143–5, 158, 164, 177, 208
biographical tradition 44, 126–9,
131–3, 138–9, 175, 216, 218
Captive Melanippe 144–53, 156–8,
177, 205
Cyclops 27, 106, 152, 205
Electra 152, 184, 202
Erechtheus 24–5, 202
death and tomb 81, 130–2
‘decline’ of tragedy 162–3
depiction of plays in art 153–7
exile as a theme in plays 28–30
in Macedonia 8–9, 17, 126–38, 190
Helen 30, 94, 136, 205
Heracles 23, 204
Heraclidae 23, 155–6, 203
Hippolytus 23–4, 136, 202
Hypsipyle 24, 30–1, 136, 202
Ion 23, 30–1, 204
Iphigenia in Aulis 134, 164, 203
Iphigenia in Tauris 23–4, 27, 206
letters attributed to Euripides 128–9
Medea 23, 76–7, 154–5, 216
Orestes 23, 130–1, 136, 177, 202
Phoenician Women 24, 28, 99, 134,
136–7, 204

- Euripides: (*cont.*)
Phrixus plays 29, 136, 204, 207
 plagiarism 216, 218
 reception and reperformances 59, 87,
 152–3, 177
 settings of tragedies 201–9
Suppliants 23, 203
Telephus 154, 156, 202
Temenidae and *Temenus* 120, 122,
 126, 128, 130, 135–7, 202
Trojan Women 152, 209
Wise Melanippe 134, 144–51, 207
- fees 14, 16, 37, 39, 60–2, 111, 123, 128,
 192, 197
- festivals 1, 11, 17–19, 34, 38, 45–6, 60–4,
 93–4, 156, 162, 166–9, 171, 179–80,
 187–8, 193–4
 Aegean 46, 57, 167–8, 185, 192
 Athens 2–4, 11, 31, 48, 60–1, 65–82,
 91, 171–2, 175, 177, 180–1, 190,
 196–7
 athletic competitions 39–40
 Delphi 178, 182
 Macedonia 8, 130, 138, 190–1
 Peloponnese 49–51, 94, 96, 183–4
 Sicily 98, 100, 102–3, 105, 112
- figurines, of comic actors 173
- funerary monuments 54, 72, 78–9, 87,
 132–3, 213
 in myth and tragedy 104, 142–3, 154,
 157, 205
- Gelon, tyrant 100–1, 110, 112, 223
- Gorgias, orator 5, 38–9, 174
- Greek West (Italy and Sicily):
 art 6, 153–8
 as a destination 12, 33, 38, 43, 53–5,
 60–1, 80–1, 189–90
 performers from the Greek
 West 39–40, 43, 73–5, 215,
 219, 221
 theatre 1, 7–9, 23–24, 26, 71, 78, 93,
 95–9, 103–17, 126, 131, 144–59,
 162, 167, 181–2, 184, 187, 189, 205,
 222–4
 tyrants 75, 100–1, 153
- Gymnopaedia, festival 49–51
- Hegemon, comic poet 86, 211
- Hegemon, lyric poet 78, 217
- Hellanicus, historian 51–2, 148
- Hellen 29, 123, 145, 148–50, 158–9
- Heraclea, Italy 146, 153–7
- Heraclea Pontica 74, 83, 186–7,
 212–13, 219
- Heracles 20, 21, 80, 89–90, 118–21, 123,
 135, 145, 158, 172, 202, 205–6
 pillars of Heracles 34
- Heraclidae 20, 118–26, 135–7, 141, 150
- Heraclides Ponticus 84, 96, 187, 213
- Hermione, daughter of Menelaus 143–4
- Hermione, city 43, 78, 118, 217
- Hesiod 10, 21, 43–6, 56, 61, 77, 123, 153
- Hieron I, tyrant of Syracuse 42, 54, 81,
 100–12, 115, 119–20, 223–4
- Hipparchus, Pisistratid 48, 212
- Hippias, sophist 22, 38–9, 84
- Hipponax 43, 56, 62, 102
- homecoming, *see nostos*
- Homer 10–11, 19–20, 26, 43, 45–6,
 51–4, 57, 89, 101–2
Iliad 10, 26, 45, 61, 89, 156, 209
Odyssey 10, 27, 35, 45, 61, 63,
 148–50, 156
Homeric Hymn to Apollo 45–6, 53, 57
- Homeridae 45, 52
- Hyacinthia, festival 25, 49–50, 68
- Hyginus, mythographer 120–1, 123, 146–7
- Ibycus 22, 43, 47, 49–50, 54–5, 58, 63
- Iliad*, *see* Homer
- Ionians 46, 151, 188
- Ion of Chios 74, 79–81, 87–90, 211
- Ion of Ephesus 48, 214
- Isocrates 38, 67–8, 78, 187
- Isthmia 30, 38, 40, 80, 89, 182–3, 205
- Italy, *see* Greek West
- Ithaca 26, 205
- Jason 20, 154, 206, *see also* argonauts
- Lasus, poet 43, 48, 78, 217
- Lemnos 89, 180, 201
- Lenaea, festival 65, 68, 70–1, 73–5, 82,
 181, 183, 190, 213–15, 218–21
- Lesbos 43, 47, 51–2
- localization 9, 31, 129, 140, 152, 153, 155
- Locri, Italy 43, 51, 54, 100, 215
- Locris 73, 214
- Lydia 28, 33, 43–4, 47, 52–3, 90, 206
- lyric poetry 2, 10–12, 13, 59, 88–9, 94,
 102, 110, 130, 189, *see also*
 dithyramb

- Macedonia 8–9, 12, 17, 21, 26, 43, 60,
 68, 75–6, 82, 117–39, 158–9, 184,
 187, 189–91, 193, 208
 Magnes, poet 47
 Magnesia, northern Greece 128, 131, 139
 Magnesia on the Maeander 168
 Marathon 203
 markets 17, 36–7, 158, 162
 Mausolus 81, 186
 Medea 76, 154–5, 205–7, 216
 Megara 40, 43, 71, 73, 83, 95, 217,
 219–20
 Melanippides I 81–2, 211
 Melanippides II 81–2, 130, 212
 Meletus, poet 83, 84, 216, 219–20
 Messenia 46, 118, 122, 207
 Metapontum 43, 75, 146–8, 151–7, 215
 metics 5, 34–5, 68, 70, 78–80, 85, 213
 Midas, aulos player 78, 215
 Miletus 23, 43, 89, 178, 201, 223
 Molossia, *see* Epirus
 Mycenae 202
 Mynniscus 7, 77, 172–3, 211
 Mytilene 43, 51, 52, 56, 212, *see also*
 Lesbos

 Nemea 30–1, 40, 43, 202
 Neophron 76–7, 83, 86, 94, 205, 216
 Neoptolemus, actor 75, 189–90,
 192, 220
 Neoptolemus, hero 30, 140–3, 209
 network 11–13, 18–19, 34, 38, 40, 44, 46,
 51, 53, 65, 91, 94, 108, 143, 161, 169,
 178–9, 185, 187–8, 196–7
 network theory, *see* network
 new music 62, 163
 Nicolaus, historian 47, 124
 non-citizens at Athens 35–6, *see also*
 metics
 audience at festivals 66–9
 performers 69–90, 94, 211–21
nostos 20, 142–3

 Odysseus 21, 28, 33, 35, 61, 89–90, 102,
 148–9, 153, 205, 209–10
Odyssey, *see* Homer
 Oedipus 23, 28–9, 204
 Oeniades, aulos player 77, 214
 Olympia 22, 30, 37, 38, 43, 49, 67–8,
 110, 123, 183
 Orestes 23, 28, 30, 108, 113, 118, 143–4,
 154, 156–7

 Palici 106–8, 115
 Panathenaea, festival 41, 48, 60, 70, 78,
 212, 214–15
 panhellenism 5, 10, 24–5
 Paros 56, 68
 patrons and patronage 14, 16–17, 44, 49,
 55, 58, 60–4, 80–1, 93, 100, 103,
 105, 111–14, 125, 128–30, 138,
 140–1, 188–93, 212
 Peloponnese:
 and tragedy 24–6, 118–24, 207
 festivals and performers 39, 44, 48–9,
 71, 73–4, 77–8, 94–7, 184–5,
 216–17, 221
 Persia 36, 56, 86, 185, 206, 218
 Persian wars 10, 24, 74, 109–15,
 see also Salamis, battle of
 Philip II, king of Macedonia 124, 167,
 180, 190–3, 215
 Philoxenus, lyric poet 43, 189
 Phlius 40, 44, 76–8, 83, 94–5, *see also*
 Aristias and Pratinas
 phylax plays 182, 184
 Phocis 204
 Phrixus 29, 207
 Phrynichus, tragic poet 24, 54, 76,
 99–100, 177–8, 201–2, 204, 206,
 208, 222–4
 Phrynys 43, 52, 82, 212
 pilgrimage, *see* *theōria*
 Pindar 20–2, 40–1, 43, 47, 54, 58, 61–2,
 79, 81, 88, 100–7, 110–16, 119–20,
 132, 142–4, 171, 183, 185, 202, 214
 Pisistratids 48, 100, 125, *see also*
 Hipparchus
 Plato, comic poet 172, 214
 Plato, philosopher 84, 187, 189–90
 on Archelaus of Macedon 125
 on poets and poetry 45, 48, 62, 68,
 71, 98–9, 128, 129–30, 174–5, 184,
 188, 214
 on sophists 22, 37–9
 on specialization 15–16, 41
 poets:
 and actors 170–8
 and myth 24–5, 115, 143, 147, 196
 and professionalism 14–18, 57–64,
 101–2, 170–1, 192–3
 and travel 9, 13, 34–8, 43–64, 70–1,
 93–4, 101–2, 104, 111–12, 127, 130,
 132, 138, 158, 166, 168–9, 179,
 188–9

poets: (*cont.*)

- comic 73–5, 79, 86–7, 95, 98, 127,
152, 171, 211, 213, 215, 217, 220–3
dithyrambic, *see* dithyramb
tragic 1–2, 6, 68, 71–97, 128–9, 161,
163, 171, 177–8, 186, 197–8,
211–13, 215–16, 218–20, 222–4
polis 3, 5, 10–12, 15, 20, 23, 65–6, 162–4,
169–70
Polycrates, tyrant of Samos 36, 47–8,
58, 103
politics 3–12, 23–4, 56, 65–8, 74, 105,
109, 115, 164–70, 181, 196
Polus, tragic actor 37, 168, 173, 192, 220
Potamon, aulos player 72, 79, 214
Pratinas 7, 51, 76–7, 83–5, 94–6, 114,
197, 207, 216,
Pronomus, aulos player 77, 214
prizes 16, 41–2, 60–3, 70, 72, 75, 77, 98,
171–3, 192, 198
professionalism 13–17, 34–42, 60–2,
169–70
Prometheus 27, 33
[Aeschylus] *Prometheus Bound* 106,
206, 212
Prometheia, festival 70
Protagoras 38–9
Pythia, festival 30, 40, 101, 215
Python, poet 84, 186, 205

reperformances 4, 6, 8, 11, 58–9, 104,
109, 112, 114, 138–9, 145, 152, 165,
170, 177–8, 214
Rhodes 21–2, 30, 37, 43, 180, 188, 220

sacrifice 25, 50, 60–1, 90, 101, 113, 143,
145, 190, 209
Salamis, battle of 24, 80, 109–14
Salamis, city on Cyprus 30, 143
Salamis, island 142–3, 203, 217
Salmoneus 149, 151, *see also* Tyro
Samos 34, 36–7, 43, 48–9, 167–8,
185, 192
Sappho 43, 52–4
Satyrus, comic actor 190, 218
Satyrus, historian 124, 127, 213, 218
Satyrus, lyric poet 217
sculpture 48, 58, 79, 156, 172, 212
sculptors 35, 37
Scyros 75, 142, 201, 220
Scythia 27, 33, 206–7, 218
Seriphos 201

Sicily, *see* Greek West
Sicyon 43, 49–50, 76–7, 83, 94–6,
139–40, 183, 207, 216–17
Simonides I 211–12
Simonides II, son of Leoprepes 43, 48,
54, 59, 62–3, 81, 84, 100, 104, 106,
110–11, 212, 217
Siris, city 43, 54, 146–8, 151, 153, 156
skill *see technē*
Solon 14–15, 17, 43, 47–8, 56, 96, 174
song culture 11, 13, 18, 114, 161,
179, 198
sophists 15, 36–40, 47, 49, 166
Sophocles 24–5, 27–31, 79–80, 82,
88–90, 142, 149, 154, 172, 187,
201–9, 212, 216, 223
Ajax 23, 142, 209
biographical tradition 44, 104, 174–5
Oedipus at Colonus 22–3, 29, 203
Oedipus the Tyrant 153, 204
performance at Eleusis 182
Triptolemus 31, 203
Sparta 21–2, 24–5, 37–8, 43–4, 71, 74–5,
77, 80–2, 110–12, 115, 118–22, 141,
144, 183, 187, 207
festivals 49–55, 68, 94–5
Spintharus 74, 83, 86, 186
specialization 14–17, 35–7, 40–2,
169–77, 197, *see also*
professionalism and *technē*
Stesichorus I 21, 43, 54–5, 150
Stesichorus II 215
symposium 59, 80, 100
Syracuse *see* Greek West

technē 14–17, 35–8, 42, 67, 71–2, 165,
174–6, 188, 197
technitai 167, 185, 186, 188, 190, 191–2,
see also artists of Dionysus
Tegea 78, 83, 177, 207
Telephus 28, 154, 184, 206–7
Telestes, lyric poet 47, 81, 215
Temenus 118, 121–4, 135–7, 150
Terpander 43, 47, 50–4, 82
Thargelia, festival 70, 77–8, 214, 217
Thasos 43, 54, 56, 181
theatres 50, 98, 104, 162, 166–7, 180–8,
191, 192–3
Athens, theatre of Dionysus 2, 18, 65,
68–9, 98
Thebes, Boeotia 21–3, 26, 28, 40, 43, 77,
95, 118, 148, 203–4

- Theodectas 28, 72, 74, 78–9, 81, 83, 87, 89, 163, 178, 186, 201–2, 210, 213, 219
- Theodorus, actor 173, 175–6, 181–2, 192
- Theognis and the *Theognidea* 43, 56, 59, 198
- Theognis, tragic poet 83–4, 219–20
- Theopompus, historian 72, 124
- theōria* 31, 34, 63, 143
- theōrikon* 4
- Theron, tyrant 54, 100, *see also* Emmenids
- Thessaly 26, 29–30, 43, 113, 140, 142, 145, 148, 207–8
- Thespis 76, 96, 174, 224
- Thoricus 203
- Thrace 23, 26, 68, 208, 217–19
- Timaeus, historian 148, 189, 223
- Timotheus, lyric poet 43, 82, 89, 130, 133, 213–14
- Timotheus, tyrant 186
- tomb, *see* funerary monuments
- travel 12, 18, 33–42, 68, 90–1
- in myth and tragedy 19–21, 27–32, 90, 107–8, 115–18, 120, 141–5, 148, 159, 202, 204–5, 207
- travelling poets and other performers 7, 9, 13–14, 16, 18, 43–66, 72, 74, 81–2, 85, 91, 93–4, 97, 100–5, 111–12, 126–32, 135–9, 161–2, 169–70, 176–9, 182–4, 188–94, 196–8, 222–4
- Triptolemus 24–5, 31, 203
- Troezen 24, 202
- Troy and the Trojan War 10, 20–1, 26, 58, 89, 141–4, 151, 205, 208–10
- Tyro 149, 207; *see also* Salmoneus
- Tyrtaeus 43–4, 118
- vase painting 6, 10, 26, 48, 70, 95, 104, 153–7, 162–4, 172–3, 184, 214
- Vitae*, *see* biographical tradition
- Xenophanes 41, 43, 53–4, 56, 166
- Xenophon 16, 36, 39, 46, 50, 100, 102, 183
- Zeus 29, 81, 102–3, 106–7, 110–11, 182, 204